

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1939

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 17, 1939)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, January 20, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, at this point I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask for a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	King	Reed
Andrews	Downey	La Follette	Reynolds
Ashurst	Ellender	Lee	Russell
Austin	Frazier	Lewis	Schwartz
Bailey	George	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Gerry	Logan	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	Lucas	Shipstead
Barkley	Gillette	Lundeen	Smathers
Bilbo	Glass	McCarran	Smith
Bone	Green	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Guffey	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Gurney	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Harrison	Miller	Tobey
Byrd	Hatch	Minton	Townsend
Byrnes	Hayden	Murray	Truman
Capper	Herring	Neely	Tydings
Caraway	Hill	Norris	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Nye	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Holt	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Connally	Hughes	Pepper	Wheeler
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	White
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wiley

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a conference of Governors of the New England States on the flood-control problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—VIEWS OF MINORITY

As in legislative session,

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 20th instant, Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, reported it on January 21, 1939, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 4) thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that at the end of the executive session he hopes to have the Senate resume legislative session for the purpose of the presentation of petitions, the introduction of bills and resolutions, and to have a message read from the President, otherwise the Chair would submit the message of the President at this time. If Senators desire to go into legislative session to introduce resolutions and bills, and so forth, the Chair, of course, will entertain such a motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. McNARY. I would object to going into legislative session. I think we should clean up the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me make a statement. On last Friday unanimous consent was given the Committee on Appropriations to make a report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939. I do not know whether or not the majority report has been printed, but I desire to file minority views; and, inasmuch as the majority report is now in the Printing Office, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the minority views may be printed at once.

Mr. McNARY. I think that consent was given by the Senate on Friday, although, of course, it may be renewed today.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the minority, to have printed the views of the minority.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be assumed that the consent given the committee to make a report would carry with it the right to file minority views as well as the majority report.

Mr. KING. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that be so, that is all I desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the general rules, the committee report is one thing and the minority views another.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the desire to have these documents printed together, I think that there might be an exception made, and if necessary, that the Senator from Tennessee might be permitted to file the minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection, as in legislative session, to the Senator from Tennessee filing the views of the minority?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to object, of course, but I desire to ask if the hearings have been printed as yet?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have been.

Mr. BORAH. And are they available?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; they are available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(Mr. McKELLAR, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the views of the minority of that committee to accompany the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, which were ordered to be printed as pt. 2 of Rept. No. 4.)

NOMINATION OF HARRY L. HOPKINS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harry L. Hopkins to be Secretary of Commerce? [Putting the question.]

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I rise not for the purpose of delivering a speech or making any unnecessary remarks, but because I am sure there are some Senators who desire to address the Senate on the subject of the pending nomination; and, therefore, I did not want the Vice President to proceed too rapidly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the duty of the Chair to put the question that is pending before the Senate if no Senator seems to care to address the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Harrison	McCarran
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Hatch	McKellar
Ashurst	Connally	Hayden	McNary
Austin	Danaher	Herring	Maloney
Bailey	Davis	Hill	Mead
Bankhead	Donahey	Holman	Miller
Barbour	Downey	Holt	Minton
Barkley	Ellender	Hughes	Murray
Bilbo	Frazier	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Bone	George	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Borah	Gerry	King	Nye
Bridges	Gibson	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Bulow	Gillette	Lee	Pepper
Burke	Glass	Lewis	Pittman
Byrd	Green	Lodge	Radcliffe
Byrnes	Guffey	Logan	Reed
Capper	Gurney	Lucas	Reynolds
Caraway	Hale	Lundeen	Russell

Schwartz
Schwellenbach
Sheppard
Shipstead
Smathers

Smith
Stewart
Taft
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah

Tobey
Townsend
Truman
Tydings
Vandenberg

Van Nuys
Wagner
Wheeler
White
Wiley

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not intend to consume any of the time of the Senate with reference to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins. However, I do wish to insert in the RECORD a statement made before the committee by Mr. William Averell Harriman, chairman of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Harriman appeared before the committee asking the privilege of making a statement endorsing Mr. Hopkins for the office of Secretary of Commerce and recommending the confirmation by the Senate of his appointment. He did not act officially in behalf of the council, but stated that because of his position as chairman of the council he desired to make the statement which I ask to insert in the RECORD. I ask also to have his statement followed by a list of the membership of the Business Advisory Council. These gentlemen belong to both political parties. The character of the membership will be some indication to the Senate of the kind of man Mr. Harriman is and should be of interest in connection with the statement he made in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins' nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement of Mr. Harriman is as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM AVERELL HARRIMAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NEW YORK CITY

The CHAIRMAN. Give us your name.

Mr. HARRIMAN. William Averell Harriman.

The CHAIRMAN. Your address?

Mr. HARRIMAN. 59 Wall Street.

The CHAIRMAN. Your occupation?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I am a partner of Brown Bros., Harriman & Co., private bankers, and chairman of the board of the Union Pacific Railroad Co.

The CHAIRMAN. You wish to make a statement? Proceed.

Mr. HARRIMAN. In addition to those activities I am at the present time chairman of the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce, and as such I am very much interested in this appointment.

I have asked you for the privilege of appearing before you gentlemen to endorse Mr. Hopkins for this position, and to express my faith in him in this position, and my belief in his ability, and my expectation that he will fill the position with competence and honor.

I have known Mr. Hopkins since the spring of 1933. I came to the conclusion that he was well equipped to handle this position prior to my discussing the policies that he intends to pursue in that position.

I noticed in the newspapers that there were rumors about the possibility of his appointment. I gave the matter very serious consideration, and came to the decision that I have stated prior to discussing them with him.

It has been my privilege to spend hours with him since his appointment, and it is my conviction that he has a real grasp of the problems. He has appeared before you very modestly and said that he does not know much about these problems, but from my discussion I have had with him I believe he does understand the problems.

His experience in dealing with the unemployment situation has brought him in contact with a great many businesses, and he has been here studying in his own way the things that have caused unemployment. I find that he has a grasp of them. And when he makes up his mind what he wants to do it is my belief that he will move in directions that are sound and in the interest of the stimulation of business.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get what you mean by that. What do you mean by that. What do you mean by the directions that are sound? Let us get some idea of your meaning.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Mr. Hopkins' views or my views?

The CHAIRMAN. No; you said that you believed that he would move in directions that are sound. You have some ground for that statement. I should like to know what you think are sound directions.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I will be glad to generalize on that question. I think one of the difficulties of the present situation has been the lack of understanding of objectives between business and government. In connection with that the council is on record to the President a year ago indicating the directions in which the Council felt that the administration and business could move for the

advantage of the country. The council has been advising the Secretary of Commerce since the spring of 1933. It has expressed its independent point of view on many occasions to the Secretary and to the President. The President has released some of those reports, and they are a matter of record. Now, those generally indicate that there are some fronts in which a closer understanding of objective and method between government and business would be helpful for the economy, and I believe Mr. Hopkins has a grasp of those problems. What he is going to do I do not know, because in my talks with him I suppose most of the time he was asking me questions.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the list of the membership of the Business Advisory Council, which I send to the desk. It will consume but a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Legislative Clerk read as follows:

BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

W. A. Harriman, chairman.
Charles A. Cannon, vice chairman.
Clarence Francis, vice chairman.
De Lancey Kountze, vice chairman.
Prentiss L. Cooley, assistant to the chairman.
Walter White, assistant to the chairman.
E. Willard Jensen, executive secretary.

MEMBERS

F. B. Adams, chairman of the executive committee, Air Reduction Co., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
William L. Batt, president, S. K. F. Industries, Inc., Front Street and Erie Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
John D. Biggers, president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., Toledo, Ohio.
James F. Brownlee, president, Frankfort Distilleries, Inc., Louisville, Ky.
Charles A. Cannon, president, Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N. C.
W. Dale Clark, president, The Omaha National Bank, Omaha, Nebr.
William L. Clayton, chairman of board, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Cotton Exchange Building, Houston, Tex.
W. Howard Cox, president, The Union Central Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.
William H. Danforth, chairman of the board, Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis, Mo.
R. R. Deupree, president, the Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.
William C. Dickman, president, American Locomotive Co., 30 Church Street, New York, N. Y.
Gano Dunn, president, J. G. White Engineering Corporation, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
Robert G. Elbert, 599 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
W. Y. Elliott, department of government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
John H. Fahey, Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, First Street and Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
T. Austin Finch, president, Thomasville, Chair Co., Thomasville, N. C.
Robert V. Fleming, president, the Riggs National Bank, Washington, D. C.
James F. Fogarty, president, the North American Co., 60 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
M. B. Folsom, treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co., 343 State Street, Rochester, N. Y.
Clarence Francis, president, General Foods Corporation, 250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
H. B. Friele, vice president, the Nakat Packing Corporation, Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.
A. P. Greensfelder, president, Fruin-Colnon Contracting Co., Merchants-Laclede Building, St. Louis, Mo.
Rolland J. Hamilton, president, American Radiator Co., 40 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
Henry I. Harriman, division of metropolitan planning New England Power Building, 441 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass.
W. A. Harriman (chairman of the council), chairman of the board, Union Pacific Railroad Co., New York, N. Y.
Henry H. Helmann, executive manager, National Association of Credit Men, 1 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Charles R. Hook, president, the American Rolling Mill Co., Middletown, Ohio.
William A. Julian, the Treasurer of the United States, Washington, D. C.
H. P. Kendall, president, the Kendall Co., 140 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.
Fred I. Kent, treasurer, National Industrial Conference Board, 100 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
De Lancey Kountze, chairman of the board, Devos & Reynolds Co., Inc., 1 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
Morris E. Leeds, president, Leeds & Northrup Co., 4901 Stenton Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. K. Leith, department of geology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Paul W. Litchfield, president, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., 1144 East Market Street, Akron, Ohio.

Earl M. McGowin, vice president, W. T. Smith Lumber Co., Inc., Chapman, Ala.
 George H. Mead, president, Mead Corporation, Dayton, Ohio.
 D. M. Nelson, vice president, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.
 J. C. Nichols, president, J. C. Nichols Investment Co., 310 Ward Parkway, County Club Plaza, Kansas City, Mo.
 George A. Sloan, 60 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 E. T. Stannard, president, Kennecott Copper Corporation, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 E. R. Stettinius, Jr., chairman, United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 R. Douglas Stewart, vice president, Quaker Oats Co., 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
 Gerard Swope, president, General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 Walter C. Teagle, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
 J. T. Trippe, president, Pan American Airways System, Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.
 Thomas J. Watson, president, International Business Machines Corporation, 590 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 Sidney J. Weinberg, partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co., 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
 Samuel P. Wetherill, president, Wetherill Engineering Co., Inc., 1402 Morris Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
 W. H. Wheeler, Jr., vice president, Pitney-Bowes Postage Meter Co., Stamford, Conn.
 A. D. Whiteside, president Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 290 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 H. Hyer Whiting, 1201 Hobart Building, San Francisco, Calif.
 S. Clay Williams, chairman of the board, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.
 R. W. Woodruff, president, the Coca-Cola Co., 101 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from South Carolina. Because of the confusion in the Chamber, I was unable to hear all that was said. I am sure the Senator is not suggesting, merely because Mr. Harriman appeared as a personal witness before the committee, that that carries with it the implication that the entire advisory council is joining Mr. Harriman in recommending the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins' nomination.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan states that he did not hear all that I said. If he had been able to hear it, he would have heard me say that Mr. Harriman did not say he was speaking in behalf of the council as a result of any action taken by them. He said that he was speaking because, as chairman of the Business Advisory Council, he was interested in this question. I had the list of the membership read because the membership which has just been read elected Mr. Harriman as its chairman.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This the membership created by Mr. Roper while he was Secretary?

Mr. BYRNES. Originally the council was created by the Secretary. According to my information, members have been added by the council. I may say to the Senator from Michigan also that I happen to know that on the day Mr. Harriman appeared three members of the council came to Washington voluntarily for the purpose of testifying. I know that one of them, Gen. Robert G. Elbert, of the council, asked about making a statement. Mr. Donald Comer also desired to make a statement. They were advised by friends that the committee did not think it necessary to go into any exhaustive hearing along that line.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is this the same group which threatened two or three times during the past year or two to resign because of its dissatisfaction with the general trend of affairs?

Mr. BYRNES. I never heard of the group doing that. If they were a group who wanted to resign because of general dissatisfaction, I cannot understand why they did not resign. If they expressed that view and thereafter did not resign, I think they must have concluded that they had been misinformed by the Senator from Michigan or some other person and changed their minds after they had learned the facts and desired to continue in office.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Or else they lost their nerve; one or the other.

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator from Michigan wants to say that some of the gentlemen whose names have been read lost their nerve, he may say it. I think they have just as much courage as has the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether he will state for the RECORD how this committee of whom he speaks is really made up, by whom appointed, and from what sources it comes.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I understand that the Business Advisory Council was originally formed at the suggestion of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Roper. Thereafter its members were appointed on the suggestion of this group of businessmen, who have themselves selected members to serve representing the various industries of the country.

Mr. LEWIS. What is it they do? What office are they assumed to perform?

Mr. BYRNES. They come to Washington once a month and present to the Department of Commerce and to the President their views about the business of the country, and express their aims and hopes with reference to the relationship between business and Government.

Mr. LEWIS. May I assume that if they had had objection to Mr. Hopkins they could have expressed it to the President; that it was within their power so to do?

Mr. BYRNES. Of course, Mr. President. On the contrary, there can be no question that the members of this council feel that the appointment is in the interest of good relations between business and Government, and will be productive of good.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly upon the pending question. I had not intended to discuss the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins until the debate of last week, but I think it is desirable that during the course of the discussion someone make the statement which I intend to make.

I intend to vote for the confirmation of Harry Hopkins' nomination without making any apologies for the fact that I intend to vote in that way, without making any apologies for anything Harry Hopkins has ever done. I think Harry Hopkins is an honest, capable administrator. I think he has done a marvelous job as Administrator of the Works Progress Administration.

It has been interesting, in going through the RECORD, to see that one by one speeches have been made in opposition to Mr. Hopkins which started out with the statement that the speaker appreciated the fact that no votes would be changed by the speech which was about to be made. I do not know just why those speeches were made if those who were speaking realized that they were not going to get any results from their speeches. I am inclined to believe that most of the speeches which have been made with reference to Mr. Hopkins, in opposition to him, have not been directed at Mr. Hopkins, but have been directed at the President of the United States and are part of the effort which is being carried on, and has been carried on for these last 2 years, to attempt to break down the confidence which the American people have in the President of the United States and the confidence which they have in the Government of the United States.

I wish to say to those who are so free in their criticism, who are so free in their efforts to destroy this confidence, that they are doing precisely the same thing in this country that was successfully done in some of the countries of Europe, and which resulted in breaking down the democracies in various parts of the world. With world conditions as they are, with conditions in this country as they are, this is no time to let personal pique or partisan politics destroy the confidence of the American people in their Government.

It has been rather amusing to me to see some of the Republican Members of this body rise and attempt to drape themselves around with a mantle of purity and, in discussing the Works Progress Administration, complain because of some politics. One thing can be said—and the Republican Members of this body should appreciate that fact—that while the Works Progress Administration was carrying on the biggest job which has ever been handled in this country, spending more money than ever has been spent by any man in this country, it has not been possible to point

a finger of suspicion at Mr. Hopkins' administration so far as honesty is concerned.

If it were not tragic it would be amusing to think of members of the Republican Party, some of whom were here during the days of Mr. Harding, Mr. Daugherty, and Mr. Fall, one of whom sat in the Cabinet during that period of time with those gentlemen, during the greatest saturnalia of corruption this Nation has ever seen, having the temerity to come and attempt to maintain that there is some purity in the position they take. I cannot believe that 6 short years of being out of office has made the Republican Party pure. It has made many of the members of that party very hungry, because they have not been on the pay roll; but it has not been able to purge from the minds of the American people the memory of the corruption which was rife during the 1920's.

As I have said, Harry Hopkins was placed in charge of the biggest and most difficult problem any man has ever had under his control in this Nation. We have here a report from the so-called Sheppard committee, and I have read it all. The remarkable thing is that, with all of the Members of this body in constant contact with Mr. Hopkins and all of them desirous of having this or that to do with the efforts of the Works Progress Administration, there was so little politics in relief as was disclosed by the Sheppard committee report.

I might say that when I speak in behalf of Harry Hopkins I speak in behalf of a man with whom I had probably the most disagreeable fight I have ever had in my life. I was amused the other day at the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Holt] assuming, as he did, that those of us who happened to support the administration were able to get projects or appointments. He calls us administration "yes" men; he can call me that if he cares to, but he cannot impute to me a motive and imply that I am an administration supporter merely in order to get some projects for my State or secure some appointment.

There are different ideas about these things. It happens to be my idea that when I go out to the people of my State and pledge myself in a campaign to a program of support of the President of the United States, it is a solemn pledge, and I do not think I have any right to come here and break the word which I gave to the people of the State. I think it is an honorable thing to carry out my word, and I am rather surprised that those who do not agree with that point of view feel free to attack those of us who do entertain that opinion and attempt to impugn our honesty and our motives.

As I have stated, I was amused at what the Senator from West Virginia said in his remarks last week, because, so far as I am concerned, I have never been able to get any appointments from the Works Progress Administration. I think that fully 90 percent of the administrative staff of the Works Progress Administration in my State belongs to the Republican Party, and I am constantly receiving resolutions from Democratic clubs protesting against that situation. That is the kind of politics we have in the Works Progress Administration in my State; and that is the State about which I know.

The Senator from West Virginia states that those of us who support the administration can get projects through which should not be undertaken. During my 4 years here I have had put through two projects which were contrary to the rules of the Works Progress Administration. They were for two country schools, which I visited and inspected. The schools which were being used and occupied were fire traps, and the lives of several hundred pupils were endangered every day. That is the only time that Harry Hopkins veered to the slightest extent from the rules and regulations which were laid down.

A number of years ago a great lawyer in this country said that we should not forget that every son of man travels an unbeaten path, a road beset with dangers and temptations which no other traveler knew, and that his footsteps should only be judged in the light of the strength he had, the

burden he had carried, and every motive, open and secret, that impelled him here and there.

To a greater extent than any other man engaged in our Government Harry Hopkins traveled an unbeaten path. The money which was appropriated for the Works Progress Administration was appropriated by the Congress, and there is not a Member of this body, though there were objections here and there to some parts of the appropriations, who did not approve some sort of an appropriation for work relief in this country.

The burden Mr. Hopkins carried was made heavier by the fact that this body itself insisted on having the right of confirmation of State directors of the Works Progress Administration. The Members of this body, by and large, during the last 5 years have done everything they could to try to have something to do with the administration of the Works Progress Administration in their own States.

In the light of everything that has happened, considering the employment of millions upon millions of people and the expenditures of billions of dollars, I think it remarkable that even this bitter partisan opposition has not been able to point to one thing which was dishonest or corrupt. I think that not only should the nomination of Harry Hopkins be confirmed, but I think there is due to him and due to his administration some measure of apology from those who are now making use of this opportunity in an attempt to smear the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harry L. Hopkins to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	King	Reed
Andrews	Downey	La Follette	Reynolds
Ashurst	Ellender	Lee	Russell
Austin	Frazier	Lewis	Schwartz
Bailey	George	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Gerry	Logan	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	Lucas	Shipstead
Barkley	Gillette	Lundeen	Smathers
Bilbo	Glass	McCarran	Smith
Bone	Green	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Guffey	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Gurney	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Harrison	Miller	Tobey
Byrd	Hatch	Minton	Townsend
Byrnes	Hayden	Murray	Truman
Capper	Herring	Neely	Tydings
Caraway	Hill	Norris	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Nye	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Holt	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Connally	Hughes	Pepper	Wheeler
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	White
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wiley

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, because of the fact that I served as a member of the Sheppard committee, and am also a member of the Commerce Committee, which considered the pending nomination, I feel it appropriate that I should express myself at least briefly concerning the pending nomination.

It seems to me that an effort was made in committee, and has been made here upon the floor, to give importance to the fact that there was not more in the way of political offenses found by the committee than is catalogued in the committee report. I think it should be noted in this connection that the Sheppard committee was appointed in June; that it held its first meeting, if my recollection is correct, on the 17th of June; that no member of the committee had previous experience in work of this character; that its staff was as inexperienced as the committee membership itself; that the investigators were hurriedly gathered together without great knowledge on the part of the committee as to their particular qualifications for this character of work; that the committee was limited by the terms of the resolution to

investigations in those States in which a senatorial election was held, and that the committee acted only upon specific charges filed before it for which there seemed to be some measure of substantiation either in the letters or in the affidavits submitted. In the face of these facts I think it is most astonishing that the committee found what the record discloses, and that it is not significant and not important what the committee did not find.

I wish to emphasize in the next place, Mr. President, that the Sheppard committee was not seeking evil in the W. P. A. I think the Senate will be ready to accept my assurance that at least the majority members of the committee would have been most pleased if they had found nothing which they felt under obligation to report to the Senate with respect to W. P. A. and its activities. I think that majority would have been glad if the facts before them justified the committee in exonerating, not only Mr. Hopkins but the entire organization, of political activity of any sort or character.

I desire to emphasize next, Mr. President, that the committee investigators were not head hunters. I am warranted in the statement—and the chairman of the Sheppard committee can correct me if I am in error—that every investigator sent out was informed and cautioned that he must proceed in his task without prejudice, without bias; that he was expected to search only for the truth and to report the truth as he saw the truth to the committee.

Mr. President, these were the general circumstances, and that is the spirit in which the Sheppard committee undertook its investigations.

The discussion before the Senate has ranged somewhat widely. Reference has been made to various States. But because there has been an effort, so it seems to me, to convey the impression that the offenses found by the Sheppard committee were the acts of local politicians, that the conduct to be censured was that of subordinate officers of the W. P. A. only, and in particular because I think there has been more of a disposition to challenge the findings of the committee with respect to the activities in the State of Kentucky than elsewhere, I want in what I shall say to limit myself largely to the State of Kentucky.

I can refer to but three or four matters, and to those only most generally. First, I direct the attention of the Senate to the Stokes' charges, so-called. The Stokes' charges appeared in two editions of a group of newspapers throughout the country. The first was of June 6 and the second was of June 13. The principal importance, so it seems to me, of the Stokes' charges is not in the detailed specifications found in them, but is rather in the fact that a respectable newspaper investigator and reporter, after personal investigation upon the ground, believed conditions existed which justified him in publishing throughout the country the charges which were carried in the press of the Nation.

The publication of these charges brought knowledge to the W. P. A. of intolerable conditions in the State of Kentucky, or at least it brought knowledge to them that responsible persons believed these conditions to exist in that State.

What did Mr. Hopkins do with respect to the Stokes' charges? Within 2 weeks after their publication he had taken notice of them; he had sent investigators into the State of Kentucky; these investigators had undertaken that investigation and completed their study of conditions; they had made their reports to Mr. Hopkins; Mr. Hopkins had studied those reports and he had prepared that lengthy broadside which appeared in the press on June 30. Mr. Hopkins moved with celerity; he moved promptly; he did as thorough a job of whitewashing as has ever come to my knowledge. No one was punished as the result of those charges of Mr. Stokes. No one was disciplined as the result of those charges and the findings of the investigators with respect to them. No one was discharged. On the contrary, the full implication of the announcement of Mr. Hopkins was that the W. P. A. could go full speed ahead in their political activities, not alone in that State of Kentucky but throughout the Nation. The committee of the Senate, after

its own investigation, with Mr. Hopkins conclusions before it, sustained these charges in their majority and in their substance.

The Stokes' charges were not the first knowledge of political activity brought to the attention of the W. P. A. As early as March 3 the State administrator of Kentucky had notice that requests for lists of certified workers were coming into headquarters from political organizations in that State. On March 3 he wrote a letter saying that these requests were not to be responded to by his subordinates, but were to be submitted to him in the head office of the W. P. A. in the State.

Finally there came a particular request from the headquarters of one of the candidates for the United States Senate in Kentucky. What did the State administrator do with respect to that request? He met it, and through his subordinates he authorized a canvass that was to be carried on in the first relief district of the State. That canvass was thorough and systematic. It was conducted by means of lists which were prepared in W. P. A. offices, by W. P. A. employees, during W. P. A. working hours, and on paper furnished by the political headquarters of one of the candidates.

The lists went from the district supervisor in that particular district down through 9 area timekeepers into the hands of 340 project timekeepers and the canvass was made. The canvass was of something like 18,000 certified W. P. A. workers in 32 counties of the State of Kentucky. The canvass covered more than one-quarter of all the certified W. P. A. workers in the State of Kentucky. It not only covered those workers but it made inquiries as to their families. When the canvass was completed there was in W. P. A. headquarters detailed information concerning over 17,000 W. P. A. workers in that district and information concerning their families.

The blanks asking for various items of information were brought into headquarters, and there the information upon them was transferred to typewritten sheets. Then those typewritten sheets in 32 counties of this first district in the State of Kentucky were turned over to the local political organizations of this candidate in the entire 32 counties of the district.

It was suggested that this canvass was conducted so that information might be carried to W. P. A. workers as to their voting rights, how they might register, and information of similar nature. However, the fact remains that the information was turned over to the headquarters of only one political candidate, and then the original lists were destroyed and no other political candidate had opportunity to see the records. The information included, when completed, a detailed canvass with respect to some 35,000 or 40,000 voters in that district and it was made available to the organization of a single senatorial candidate. W. P. A. was in politics in this district. The activity was not of local politicians, not of subordinate officials, but of the highest administrative officials of W. P. A. in the district.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I have only a limited time, and I hope the Senator will not press a question.

Let us take the second district in the State of Kentucky. In that district a canvass, somewhat similar to the canvass carried on in the district to which I have just alluded, was ordered by the district area engineer, and the information sought was similar to that sought in the other district of Kentucky. In this particular area, among other requests for information on the forms, there was a space for "remarks." That item was not used in the first district to which I have alluded. What was to be inserted under the heading "remarks"?

Under "remarks" was to be stated whether or not, in the opinion of the person checking, the person checked, the relief worker, was favorable to the W. P. A. program and to one of the candidates for the United States Senate in that State. Such was the information called for by the blanks circulated in the second district in the State of Kentucky.

When the data were received they were analyzed, and then the original data were destroyed and were not made generally available.

In the third district in Kentucky, mimeographed forms were used, as elsewhere. For what purpose were the mimeographed forms used? The forms were used to elicit information of a definite political character. The information was all gathered and made available for political purposes, and to political ends.

Mr. President, I do not accept the theory that because a nomination is to a Cabinet office it must be accepted as a matter of course. The Constitution does not so suggest. The office concerns not the President alone, but our commercial and industrial life. The same obligation rests upon the Senate as in the case of other nominations. I do not propose to approve the further surrender to the Executive of the constitutional rights of this body and the abandonment of its solemn obligations with respect to appointments.

The record of W. P. A. political activities, and of Mr. Hopkins' part therein, confronts the Senate. Some urge that the admitted offenses were committed by his subordinates, and that he should not be held accountable. Others have pleaded in the debate in a sort of confession in avoidance, that the fault is not his, because in all that he did, in all that he permitted, he but yielded to the demands of higher authority. These are but the excuses of sophistry and subtlety. Mr. Hopkins' name is before the Senate. We must pass upon him, and we are not privileged to consider others at this time; others who may also be responsible.

Mr. President, has there been pernicious political activity by Mr. Hopkins and the W. P. A.? I think the record demonstrates it beyond peradventure. The admissions of Mr. Hopkins and the record before us furnish an affirmative answer, and no other answer can be found.

Have those who have been guilty of these offenses been punished in any respect? They have not. With the record known to Mr. Hopkins, his failure to discipline and remove the offenders, those who have breached their trust to the distressed of America, is as great an offense as the political activities of which there is so general disapprobation.

The vote we are about to cast is of approval or of disapproval. It has never been made clear to me, Mr. President, how I can condemn a deed and exalt the doer thereof. I cannot condemn the political activities of Mr. Hopkins, and the activities for which he must stand chargeable, and vote to reward him with higher political honors.

At almost the first meeting of the Sheppard committee the chairman, with the authority of the committee, announced the objectives of the Senate resolution to be maintenance of the integrity of the elective processes; preservation of democracy at its most vital point, the ballot box, and free exercise of the voting franchise; and, to that end, the prevention of an improper use of money, or of any coercion or intimidation by any person, group, or agency outside or inside the Government. Did the committee statement accurately reflect the objective of the Senate during the last session of Congress? Does that sentiment find sanction in the conscience of the Senate today? By our votes today we may serve the purpose announced, or we may prove our disloyalty to it.

Mr. President, we boast of our right of free speech and our free press; we take pride in our right of assembly; we glory in our freedom of conscience and of worship, but these are no more secure than is the freedom of the ballot. The freedom of the ballot is in direct jeopardy if those, hungry and without shelter, who, in poverty and distress, face a forbidding future, must accept political servitude as the price of public relief in their misfortunes.

Mr. President, I feel constrained to vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Harry L. Hopkins.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything about the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins' nomination. However, my recollection was refreshed by listening to the

speech of my friend the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITTE]. I was just a little astonished that the Senator from Maine should be so outraged at the puny charges which have been laid at the door of Mr. Hopkins. I was surprised that he could work himself into such a frenzy about "pernicious political activity" and about the free exercise of the franchise and the coercion of voters on W. P. A. and refer to servitude as the price of their misfortune. That surprised me because, Mr. President, in 1936 I was on the Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, which was similar to the committee of which the Senator from Maine was a member during the last campaign. The committee of which I was a member, as one of its duties in that campaign, found it necessary to investigate some of the things that were going on in Maine. The Senator who has just spoken, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITTE], was a candidate for reelection in 1936 in Maine.

There is a statute in that State which provides that a pauper may not vote, and the attorney general of the great State of Maine, from which the eminent Senator who has just spoken comes, had construed that statute to mean that a man on W. P. A. was a pauper and could not vote in Maine; the Republican organization in Maine was using that statute and that construction of the statute by the attorney general of the State of Maine to prevent poor, unfortunate people on W. P. A. in the State of Maine from casting their votes, thus pauperizing all those who were on W. P. A. because they wanted to vote. They were going to apply the screws of that statute to the poor, unfortunate people who were on W. P. A. in Maine, and the Senator from Maine never had a word to say about it.

The committee listened for a voice coming from the woods in Maine that we would recognize as the soft and dulcet tones of the Senator from Maine protesting that his State should say that a pauper should not vote; but we listened in vain for such a voice. The Senator from Maine never said a word. Quite to the contrary, he was ready to accept the votes that would come to him in 1936 by applying the pauper statute of Maine and saying to the paupers in Maine, as well as those on W. P. A., "You cannot vote."

Here is what the report filed by the election committee in 1936 said:

Of major importance in this connection was the revelation that election officials were threatening persons on the relief rolls that they would not be permitted to vote in the election because, under an interpretation of the law in Maine, they would be regarded as paupers and disfranchised. After examining the law on the subject Mr. Walter Myers, counsel for the committee, prepared a memorandum reviewing the pauper laws in Maine, and expressing doubt as to whether anyone receiving relief, even though it should come from the State treasurer of Maine, would be disqualified as a voter. This information was sent to State officials by the committee, and they later clarified the situation by a new interpretation of the law.

But until the Campaign Expenditures Committee came along and investigated that matter and called it to the attention of the country they were applying in Maine the pauper statute to W. P. A. workers; they were not going to let them vote; and the Senator from Maine had nothing to say about that. "Pernicious political activity." What more pernicious political activity can Senators think of than for a State to attempt to enforce such a dastardly law as that; a law that would disfranchise poor people simply because they did not have a job and the Government was going to give them an opportunity to work? "Political activity." The Senator from Maine is outraged because of what was done in Kentucky; but he never said a word about Maine in 1936.

I think I heard the Senator say that he was surprised not at what the committee of which he was a member this year found but at the things that it did not find; that he was surprised not at the things they found but at the things that they did not have time to go into. One of the things that would have been interesting, I think, to the Senate if the committee had gone into it would have been the hook-up in Maine between the Townsend clubs and the Republican Party. That movement did not start merely in 1938; it started also

in 1936, because the report of the Campaign Expenditures Committee in 1936 pointed out:

In addition to questionable bookkeeping practices, the investigators found that some money had been received from persons interested politically in the Townsend movement. One individual stated that the Republican State committee had reimbursed him in excess of \$250 for funds he had used to defray expenses of a group sent to the Townsend convention in Cleveland, and that this money was used to defray said expenses to Cleveland, and also to organize Townsend clubs. Canceled checks were found by investigators showing that the amount of reimbursement probably exceeded \$500.

This year, of course, as everybody knows, the Townsend clubs backed the Republican candidates for Congress in the State of Maine. Oh, of course, that was not "playing politics with misery"; there was no "pernicious political activity" there; there was no "pernicious political activity" in paying the expenses of a Townsendsite to the Townsend convention at Cleveland; oh, no; that would not be "pernicious political activity"; that would not be "playing politics with misery." That is just politics the way they play it up in Maine.

Mr. President, as I said a while ago, in 1933 all these Townsend clubs were supporting the Republican congressional ticket in Maine, and the Republican candidates were all for the Townsend plan. The Senator from Maine might have looked into that, but he did not find time to do it.

Now, of course, we are going to have the Passamaquoddy project before us, and the Senator from Maine is for Passamaquoddy. I hope that Passamaquoddy fails, for we ought not to have two big spending programs going on in Maine—Passamaquoddy by the Democrats and the Townsend plan by the Republicans.

Mr. President, I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the testimony of the Senator from Maine ought not to be weighed too heavily in the balance against Mr. Hopkins. In looking back over the record of 1936, I cannot feel very much outraged at what happened in Kentucky when I remember what happened in Maine. I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate in order that Senators may have a proper perspective in which to view the alarm that has been sounded by the junior Senator from Maine.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that what we have witnessed here in the last few days, from the other side of the Chamber in opposition to Mr. Hopkins, is just what the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] said a while ago. We find a bunch of professional mourners, mourning for the W. P. A. I was in China a few years ago, and I remember seeing a procession moving down the streets of Canton. It was a funeral procession. In front were some boys who were scattering papers; then along came some other men carrying some sort of thing with some tinkling bells and tinkling glass upon it; then behind them came a man dressed in a white robe, with anguish written on his face such I have never seen; the anguish and sorrow of the dear Master pictured upon the cross was nothing compared to the anguish and sorrow depicted on the countenance of this man. He was a professional mourner for the Chinese who came along behind the coffin. That is what we have witnessed across the Chamber today—professional mourners for the W. P. A. workers. They are very much concerned lest we destroy their right to the franchise; oh, they are very much concerned about that; but in 1936 and in 1934 they were concerned about destroying the character of people who were given jobs on W. P. A. It was then said: "People must not have jobs on W. P. A.; that would destroy their character." Now they want to protect their franchise.

Mr. President, I shall vote for Mr. Hopkins for the same reasons assigned by the Senator from Washington, because I think he is one of the finest administrators who have been produced by this administration or any other administration within a generation. I shall cast my vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins not because Mr. Hopkins has not made mistakes, but, if you please, sir, because he has made so few mistakes. What Senator here has said that Mr. Hopkins deliberately put politics into the W. P. A.? Senators speaking against confirming the nomination of Mr.

Hopkins have only pointed to the fact that, notwithstanding Mr. Hopkins was against politics in W. P. A., politics crept into W. P. A. In the 3,000 counties of the United States he administered this law. He had millions of workers under him, and he spent billions of dollars. Is it at all strange that somebody might break in and play a little politics in such a vast organization as that? The only thing that stands out in my mind is that there was so little of it.

Mr. Hopkins lays no claim to being 100-percent perfect. What Senator claims to be 100 percent perfect? Mr. Hopkins does not claim that he did not make any mistakes. He made some mistakes. Anybody administering such a program would have made mistakes.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins, not because I am a part of the present administration, not because I am known as an administration Senator, but because I believe in the splendid record that has been made by Mr. Hopkins, and his fine integrity and ability.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, for the first time, I think, in my senatorial career I shall, with the permission of the Senate, decline to vote on this nominee.

I believe, in the first place, that nothing Mr. Hopkins did or said was done or said without the sanction of the appointing power. I do not care to vote for Mr. Hopkins, because I do not want the impression to prevail anywhere that I approve anything that Mr. Hopkins has done or that Mr. Hopkins has said; nor do I approve the system under which he has acted. I voted against the lump-sum appropriation of \$4,800,000,000, to begin with, because I thought any Senator who supposed it was not to be used for political purposes was simple. It was to be used largely for those purposes, and was used largely for those purposes. On the other hand, I subscribe to the view that the President of the United States should have the widest possible latitude in selecting his advisers; and if he wants men of the Hopkins type to advise him, I think he ought to be allowed to select them, because in no event could Mr. Hopkins give the President any worse advice than persons who surround him who are not subject to confirmation by the Senate.

Moreover, I do not think Mr. Hopkins is being "kicked upstairs." I do not think he can do one whit of the wrong as Secretary of Commerce that he is alleged to have done as Director of the W. P. A., because of all the departments of the Government, that of Commerce is the most innocuous.

But, as I have said, I do not care to have anybody think that if I were to vote for Mr. Hopkins—and should I vote, I would vote for him—I approve anything he has done or said. I do not want to have to go into that explanation to thousands of people who may wonder that I should vote for a man of Mr. Hopkins' character. I never would have appointed him. I do not approve, as I have said, of anything he has done, or, as I recall, anything that he has said; but I think he has done it all, and said most of it, in the confident belief that it would be sanctioned, if it had not been directed, by the appointing power.

So, with the assent of the Senate, I shall refrain from voting at all.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the frantic efforts that a few have made to tarnish the name, asperse the motives, and sully the reputation of Harry Hopkins have been as fruitless as the performance of the mountains, which, after long and excruciating labor, with the aid of a great earthquake, finally brought forth a mean, miserable, microscopic mouse. [Laughter.]

But the mountains did at last bring forth something. The enemies of Harry Hopkins have brought forth nothing. The failure of the attack is not surprising, because—

Against the head which innocence secures,
Insidious malice aims her darts in vain,
Turn'd backwards by the powerful breath of Heaven.

A more honorable, efficient, faithful public servant than Harry Hopkins has never been subjected to senatorial investigation, dissection, or disposition. During one of the most critical periods in American history he has had charge of a

program of rehabilitation so vast and so far reaching in both its immediate and remote consequences that its mere contemplation staggers the mind and bewilders the imagination. He has successfully borne the heavy responsibility of directing the activities of an army of underprivileged human beings more numerous than the combined hosts that followed Xerxes and Caesar and Napoleon and Alexander the Great.

In comparison with the fabulous sums of public money which Harry Hopkins has, with stainless hands and heart as "chaste as the icicle that hangs on Dian's temple," spent to mitigate the misery of the unemployed, all the wealth that Croesus ever accumulated, and all the gold that Midas ever gained, shrink to the insignificant intrinsic value of the two mites which the poor widow threw into the treasury of the Lord.

Since George Washington was President, no other governmental official has, in the brief period of less than 4 years, ever rendered greater service to the people than Harry Hopkins has given them since he became the Administrator of Works Progress in 1935.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want to ask the Senator if he meant to pass by President Roosevelt when he said Mr. Hopkins had rendered more service than any other man since George Washington was President.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I meant to include even the Senator from New Hampshire, and that is as far as it is possible for human exaggeration to go. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, compared with the accomplishments of the Works Progress Administration under Harry Hopkins, the labors of Hercules become as trivial as a schoolboy's chores in the twilight of a winter day.

As a result of plans which were formulated in Harry Hopkins' busy brain and executed in accordance with his commands, the Works Progress Administration has, among countless other things, supplied employment to more than 6,000,000 of the needy of the Nation.

In addition to rescuing these millions from the curse of enforced idleness and the slough of despond, it has given billions of dollars worth of service and permanent improvements to the people. It has constructed enough modern highways to reach twice around the world; it has improved a hundred and fifty-nine thousand miles of roads and streets—enough to girdle the globe six times and more; it has constructed a hundred and thirty airplane landing fields and improved a hundred and thirty-six more; it has laid 4,000 miles of water lines and 6,000 miles of storm and sanitary sewers; it has planted more than a billion trees to prevent soil erosion and floods and to provide building material for generations yet unborn; it has built, modernized, or improved 20,000 schoolhouses and more than 30,000 other public buildings; it has bound 20,000,000 library books; made 95,000,000 pieces of clothing for the poor; and supplied more than a hundred and twenty-nine million lunches to the needy school children of the Nation.

The Works Progress Administration, under the direction of Harry Hopkins, has enriched every State; it has benefited every county; it has improved every city; it has blessed millions who, through no fault of their own, were poverty-stricken and distressed.

Regardless of slanders that may be written about Mr. Hopkins with poisoned pens, and false charges that may be made against him by venomous tongues—in spite of all the abuse that may be heaped upon him by those who burn their incense upon the altar of hate and worship at the shrine of revenge—millions of deserving Americans will, to the end of their days, say to this great man: "We were jobless and you employed us; we were homeless and you sheltered us; we were naked and you clothed us; we were hungry and you fed us. But for your service we should have been sent to the poorhouse to live in desolation and die in despair."

But at least one critic inquires: "How do we know that Mr. Hopkins is qualified to discharge the duties of the Secretary of Commerce?" In view of Mr. Hopkins' resplendent record of achievements, the response to this inquiry is as self-

evident as the answer to the question: "Can a woman talk, or a bird fly, or a fish swim?"

Anyone who can provide useful employment for more than 6,000,000 working men and women for whom the captains of private industry find it impossible to supply jobs can, in a satisfactory manner, perform the duties of any office under the Constitution or laws of the United States.

There is scarcely a community in the land in which some perfectly constructed road or street or schoolhouse or library or other public facility does not testify to the fact that Harry Hopkins is one of the most capable executives this country has ever known.

But two criticisms have been voiced in the Senate concerning Mr. Hopkins or the Works Progress Administration under his control, which must be answered. The first of these was pronounced by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. After quoting from the report of the Sheppard committee concerning the solicitation of Works Progress Administration employees in a certain State to contribute to a campaign fund, about which Mr. Hopkins knew absolutely nothing, the Senator from Kansas said:

Mr. President, I have been in public life a long time * * *. But, in all my experience and in all my reading of the history of this country, never have I found an instance or instances where political practices were so sordid, where all considerations of fairness and decency were so disregarded as in the cases reported by this committee.

I do not charge Mr. Hopkins with ordering these things; I do not even charge that he was cognizant of all these things. I do charge, however, that these things have produced a condition that represents the lowest level of political management this Nation has ever known.

My brief acquaintance with the junior Senator from Kansas impels me to believe that he would not intentionally distort a truth or misrepresent a fact. Therefore I am forced to the conclusion that the Senator was a stranger to Washington during the time that Harry Daugherty, Jess Smith, and Gaston B. Means so administered the affairs of the Attorney General's office that Daugherty was indicted and tried again and again for his alleged high crimes and misdemeanors. And in spite of the failure of the jury to convict him, those who were here during the Daugherty regime are almost unanimously of the opinion that he should have been found guilty.

Apparently the Senator is not familiar with the fact that Albert B. Fall—Mr. Harding's Secretary of the Interior—for a bribe of a hundred thousand dollars helped to defraud the Government of its naval oil reserves, and for his crime was sent to the penitentiary.

Somebody has torn from the Senator's history the sordid chapter which records the fact that Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian under both Mr. Harding and Mr. Coolidge, was convicted of a high crime which he committed in office and was sent to the penitentiary.

The Senator's history must have failed to reveal the fact that a Republican Congressman from Kentucky, whose name was on Mr. Harding's ticket, was, while in office, convicted of a felony and sent to the penitentiary.

The Senator has forgotten that within the last 15 years the Republican Governor of Illinois was required by the supreme court of his State to account for a million dollars of misappropriated funds.

The Senator has forgotten that the Republican Governor of Indiana, who was elected on Mr. Harding's ticket, was convicted of a felony and sent to the penitentiary, and that Charles R. Forbes, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau under both Mr. Harding and Mr. Coolidge, was sent to the penitentiary for frauds perpetrated against the Government and the veterans of the World War.

In the light of this record of unprecedented criminal conduct on the part of Republican Cabinet officers, Republican Governors, and other high Republican officials, and in view of the fact that no one has been able to show that Harry Hopkins has ever committed a single offense or condoned a single violation of the law, let us hope that the junior Senator from Kansas will change his mind and vote for the confirmation of the nominee.

The only other serious criticism of Mr. Hopkins, which to my knowledge has emanated from a responsible source, is that of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who, when Democratic personages or policies are under consideration, is like the hero of the following story:

"At the beginning of the World War the owner of a store said in an advertisement, 'I hate Germany; I hate Austria; I hate Turkey. I am a hundred percent patriotic.'"

"This merchant's competitor on the opposite side of the street, not to be outdone by his rival in the matter of patriotism, promptly issued an advertisement, in which he said, 'I hate not only Germany and Austria and Turkey; I hate everybody. I am 1,000 percent patriotic.'" [Laughter.]

So is my friend from New Hampshire—if it be patriotic to dislike Democrats in their official capacities.

The Senator from New Hampshire says:

Looking into Mr. Hopkins' background, according to the testimony before the committee, he fails to remember whether or not he was a Socialist, enrolled as a member of the Socialist Party.

A lapse of memory about an important matter like this is, of course, deplorable. But even if we admit that this grave charge is true, the friends of Mr. Hopkins will still find comfort in the fact that the nominee's memory is at least as good as that of the junior Senator from Kansas and much better than that of Herbert Hoover, who was once the Secretary of Commerce.

According to the record, in 1928 Mr. Hoover could not remember who had performed his marriage ceremony, how many political parties he had joined in a decade, or the name of the country of which he had been a resident for a period of 14 years. Indeed, his recollection and knowledge of his political affiliations were so utterly hopeless that in the State of Michigan in 1920 he became a candidate for the Presidential nomination as both a Republican and a Democrat at the same time.

In view of all which the Senator from New Hampshire, who would probably not admit that any prominent Republican could be guilty of any offense of omission or commission, or suffer from any infirmity touching his politics, should generously forgive Mr. Hopkins for having forgotten the exact nature of his registration on two occasions and join the majority in voting for the confirmation of the nominee.

Mr. President, the attacks that have been made upon Mr. Hopkins are about what every page of history—ancient, medieval, and modern—teaches us a good man of great accomplishment should expect.

Socrates, of whom Plato said: "He was the wisest, the justest, and the best of all the men whom I have ever known," was, for endeavoring to improve the morals and multiply the virtues of the materialistic Athenians, compelled to drink enough hemlock to put himself to sleep till the Judgment Day.

Columbus, as a reward for discovering the Western Hemisphere and giving to Spain a new world that was greater than the old, was bound with chains, cast into a dungeon, and permitted to die in want.

Abraham Lincoln, to whom the Nation will forever owe a debt of gratitude for his heroic service in abolishing slavery and preserving the Union, was when at the pinnacle of his usefulness and success murdered in cold blood.

Jesus of Nazareth brought redemption to all the world and salvation to all mankind. In return for His service and His sacrifice He was scourged by scoundrels; a crown of thorns was pressed down upon His brow; He was crucified between thieves and died in such horrible agony that the mere thought of His awful anguish will curdle the blood of the righteous till the end of time.

Therefore, in spite of the humiliation of being a target for unjustifiable abuse, Harry Hopkins should find comfort in the fact that his enemies in slandering him and persecuting him are placing him in company with the greatest immortals the world has ever known.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean to imply to this body, in bringing up Christopher Columbus and Abraham

Lincoln and Christ, that he would put Harry Hopkins in the same category; in the same class?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, no one but the Senator from New Hampshire would ask that question. The Senator knows that no one who venerates everything that is holy would, in the matter of merit, be guilty of the unpardonable sacrilege of comparing any human being with the sinless Saviour. I referred to His crucifixion simply as an outstanding illustration of the world's ingratitude to a benefactor.

So far as Columbus and Lincoln are concerned, I do neither of them an injustice, nor do I pay the nominee an extravagant compliment when I assert that he has earned a place in the hall of fame with the great Italian discoverer and the great American emancipator.

Columbus gave his all to the world. Lincoln sublimely served the cause of freedom. Harry Hopkins has served the cause of humanity with a zeal comparable to that with which Paul of Tarsus preached the gospel to the gentiles, Father Damien nursed the lepers, and St. Francis of Assisi devoted his life to the service of the poor.

How appropriate it would be for the Senator from New Hampshire and a few other critics of the nominee to emulate a certain classical example and, in the presence of Harry Hopkins, remain as speechless and silent as Dante when he—

O'ershadowed by the wings of awe,
Stood with Beatrice beneath the flaming lion's breast,
And saw the seventh crystal
And the stair of gold.

Senators, let us honor ourselves and our country today by confirming Harry Hopkins' nomination as Secretary of Commerce by an overwhelming majority. This is the kind of confirmation he deserves. Because as a result of his unparalleled achievements in behalf of the unemployed, if he should, at this hour, be unexpectedly and unfortunately summoned to that mysterious country from which no traveler returns, the last resting place of his ashes would become a pilgrim's shrine, and millions of the grateful poor, whom he has blessed, would raise to his memory a marble shaft as high as Washington's Monument and on it they would lovingly inscribe these words:

Nor wreck, nor change, nor winter's blight,
Nor Time's remorseless doom,
Shall dim one ray of glory's light
That gilds his sacred tomb.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest for the past few moments to what has been said by my very good friend the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). The Chair asks the indulgence of the Senator from North Carolina so that the Chair may make a request of those occupying the galleries.

The Chair will say to those who now occupy the Senate galleries that it is necessary that they preserve quiet, because when they indulge in conversation their voices come down into the Senate Chamber, and Members of the Senate find it impossible to hear their fellow Members who are addressing the body.

The Chair also respectfully requests that Senators maintain as much quiet as they consistently can.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

As I was about to say, I listened with a great deal of interest for the past few moments—that is to say, since I reentered the Senate Chamber—to all that was said by my personal friend and colleague the Senator from West Virginia, whom I admire, and I want to state unhesitatingly that I am in thorough accord with all that I heard him say here; and knowing him as I do know him, and as I have pleasantly known him during the years that I have been in the United States Senate, I am perfectly willing, in addition, to state unhesitatingly that I am in accord with all that he said prior to my entering this Chamber. [Laughter.] That shows how much confidence I have in MATTHEW NEELY.

The Senator from West Virginia was talking about Harry Hopkins, who has been nominated by our beloved President

to be a member of his Cabinet, as Secretary of Commerce. I have this to say, Mr. President, that I think the President of the United States has a perfect right to surround himself by advisers in whom he has confidence, to surround himself by men whom he sees fit to select.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be delighted to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must respectfully say to Senators that they should address the Chair before taking part in debate in the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator will pardon me a moment. Mr. President, it is my understanding that I shall have only 30 minutes at this time in which to address the Senate. Am I correct in that understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Then I shall have to ask my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire to bear with me for just a moment, and I shall be glad to yield to him at the expiration of my address. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I recognize that I shall be wasting the time of the Senate by addressing myself to the subject of the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins' nomination, for we all know that his nomination is going to be confirmed. We all know that there will be in the Senate only about 23 votes cast against him. So why should I presume to impose upon the time of the Senate or those honoring us with their presence here today, and who fill the galleries, by talking to the subject of the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins' nomination, when we know that his nomination is going to be confirmed?

Before proceeding to that which is closest to my heart, I wish to take this opportunity to state to the Members of this body that it will be my very great pleasure to cast a vote for Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. President, I wish now to bring to the attention of this honorable body a subject that should be of more interest to it at this time than the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins. The subject which I am about to approach is one that should appeal to every legislator in the Congress of the United States, because it has to do with the ten to twelve million people who today are out of employment in the United States of America.

Mr. President, only a few days ago it was my privilege and opportunity to address this honorable body in relation to the influx of refugees, in regard to the influx of aliens from all parts of the world who are coming here daily for the purpose of and who are usurping jobs, positions, that rightfully belong to the millions of people in America who are out of jobs, jobs that rightfully belong to the God-fearing men and women who today are and who tonight will be walking the streets of America in search of honest employment. I am happy to have made the delightful observation during the present session that there are more Members of this body now interested in that subject than there were to be found interested in it at the last session of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Mr. President, in my last address to this body, in reference to this important subject, I brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate a clipping from one of the New York newspapers describing examinations which were being taken by 500 lawyers, doctors, dentists, and nurses; refugees, aliens from across the seas, who wanted to practice their respective professions in the United States. The Members of this body who did me the honor to listen were appalled when they learned from that article that some of the doctors from Germany, Italy, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Hungary, who sought to practice their profession here, found that they could not pass the examination required by the board of control of the city of New York, and those Senators who listened to my address were appalled to learn that some of those aliens who have come here to practice their profession had the audacity, the gall, to say that they would not abide by any ruling of the board of control of the State of New York, that they would not abide by the requirements relative to examination, and if they were not

permitted to practice by comity, they would take the question to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator who has spoken many times upon the question of immigration and aliens. How can the Senator blame people who live in other countries for their desire to come to the United States when we have in the United States two cities of the beauty and with the climate of the little gem city of the mountains, Asheville, N. C., and the city of Seattle out in my State of Washington? I should like to have the Senator from North Carolina explain to me how it is that he always finds it so difficult to appreciate why people want to come to this country, because he knows as well as does everyone else, that these two places in this country, Asheville, N. C., and Seattle, Wash., act as magnets which attract to the United States the people of other countries.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity, this exceptional opportunity, to thank my distinguished friend from the great State of Washington for his contribution at this time. I appreciate what my friend has said about the little gem city of the mountains, Asheville, N. C., my home city, the most beautiful city on the face of the earth, and one of the most beautiful spots in North Carolina. The Senator is a representative of that State which has provided for the inspiration of the world the city of Seattle, the gateway to the great Northwest, the gem city of the western frontier. In order that he may be provided with information as to the amount of respect that the people of North Carolina have for his Commonwealth, in order that he may know that the people of his city of Seattle have provided inspiration for the people of North Carolina, I shall now take time to read an editorial from one of the daily newspapers of North Carolina, published at Wilmington, N. C., by my distinguished friend, the Honorable R. B. Page, in which he calls the attention of the people of North Carolina to the city of Seattle.

[From the Wilmington Star of January 13, 1939]

SEATTLE AS A PORT

An excerpt from a report by the War Department, dealing with the port of Seattle is of interest here in that it shows what Seattle has done in its climb to supremacy in the Pacific trade:

"Facilities for handling traffic include 166 piers and wharves, 16 of which are operated as oil bunkering and 2 as coal bunkering facilities. Excellent dry and cold-storage warehouses are available and space is provided for the storage of bulk freight in the open. The port has drydock facilities which can accommodate vessels up to 927 feet in length and marine railways with lifting capacities up to 700 tons. Twenty-nine plants have facilities for repairing either engines or hulls of vessels. There are six grain elevators at the port, four of which are operated as public elevators. Towboats, lighters, derrick barges, tank barges, and car floats provide sufficient floating equipment for transporting freight within the port area, and equipment is available for use in wrecking and salvage work.

"The port of Seattle district, which is coextensive with King County, is a separate municipal corporation which was established in 1911 and is under the jurisdiction of the Port of Seattle Commission. This commission has been active in promoting the interests of port, and many of the facilities for handling traffic are owned and operated by it, including eight public terminals in the outer harbor and one in the inner harbor, the public grain elevator at the Hanford Street terminal, and dry and cold-storage facilities at Spokane Street terminal, Bell Street terminal, and at pier No. 40, Smith Cove. The facilities owned and operated by the port commission are among the most modern and best-equipped terminals at the port and handle a great deal of traffic.

"During the period of 1927-36 the water-borne commerce of Seattle averaged 7,860,679 short tons annually. Imports, with an average movement of 370,855 tons, consisted chiefly of logs and piles, coal and coke, paper and manufactures, and cement and gypsum, while exports averaged 527,911 tons and consisted principally of grain and flour, lumber and lumber products, canned and dried fruits and vegetables, and logs and poles. Coastwise receipts moved in an average volume of 3,865,202 tons, the principal commodities in this trade being petroleum and petroleum products, logs and poles, sand and gravel, and fish and marine products. Coastwise shipments average 1,425,776 tons and were mainly shipments of lumber, logs and piles, grain, flour and feed, petroleum and its products, fish and marine products, and fruit and vegetables. Intraport and local traffic averaged 1,670,935 tons per year. During the calendar year

1937 the total water-borne commerce at Seattle amounted to 7,642,900 short tons."

It will be noted from this excerpt that here is a municipal corporation, largely instrumental in transforming Seattle from a frontier village into a modern metropolis and one of the world's greatest seaports. Wilmington was a port of entry when Seattle was a wilderness, but on the west coast the folks have a way of getting together and accomplishing things that might appeal to Wilmington.

Mr. President, I attribute much of the development of the great city of Seattle to my colleagues in the United States Senate; to the fact that once upon a time, not so many years ago, the able Senator who at this moment presides over the Senate resided in the State of Washington, and the people of the great Commonwealth of Washington exercised the splendid judgment of sending him to the Capital of their country as their Representative in the Halls of Congress. At the same time I shall not let pass the opportunity to congratulate the people of the State of Illinois for sending him from the great Commonwealth to the Senate of the United States. I refer, my colleagues, to your friend, to my friend, and the friend of the American people, the Honorable JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, beloved by all who live within the confines of the greatest nation upon the face of the earth.

I attribute the phenomenal growth of Seattle likewise to the continued fine representation which the State of Washington has sent to the Halls of the American Congress. I speak particularly of my colleagues, LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH and HOMER T. BONE.

I believe I have evidenced my appreciation of the action of the Senator from Washington in calling attention to my beloved home, the little gem city of the mountains, one of the most beautiful cities of North Carolina, a city located within the confines of the greatest political subdivision in all the world, the State of North Carolina.

Mr. President, I wish to speak further today in regard to the all-important subject of restricting immigration and mandatory deportation of alien criminals and alien undesirables.

As will be recalled, a moment ago I spoke about the 500 professional men and women, doctors, lawyers, dentists, and nurses, who have come in from the four corners of the earth, aliens usurping the business of the millions of boys and girls, men and women, who today are walking the streets in search of honest employment. However, I have something else to bring to the attention of the Senate today, something in which Senators will be interested, something which I clipped from a newspaper several days ago. It pertains to the smuggling business in America.

I was dumbfounded when, on January 19, I observed the following in the columns of the Washington Herald, with a New York headline:

ARREST BARES SMUGGLING OF ALIEN HOSTS INTO UNITED STATES

NEW YORK, January 18 (C. T. P. S.).—An international alien smuggling ring, geared to bring more than 10,000 aliens a year into the United States via the Canadian border and widely patronized by Jewish refugees, was disclosed today through the arraignment of its Canadian director in Brooklyn Federal court.

Arrested at Rouses Point, N. Y., Friday night and held incommunicado since then at Ellis Island, Spyros Cyrcos, 38, of Montreal, boasted to Assistant United States Attorney James G. Scilleppi that he had conducted at least 25,000 aliens across the border within the last 2 years.

If that statement be true—and I have no doubt that it is—it reveals a shameful state of affairs in the United States of America. It is shameful that we should permit thousands upon thousands of aliens annually to enter the United States illegally, and to remain here in violation of our law, particularly in view of the fact that we have millions upon millions of boys and girls, men and women, in this country, for whom we have been endeavoring to find employment for the past 5 years. As yet, we have been unsuccessful in having industry absorb those millions upon millions of boys and girls, men and women.

I am happy indeed to learn that our legislators in Washington are now more deeply interested than ever before in

this momentous question. In reference to retaining the barriers in the form of regulations, in order that those who desire to come to America may not become public charges, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that a number of years ago a ruling was made to the effect that no alien should be provided a visa and be permitted to come to this country unless our consular agents were convinced that he would not become a public charge, unless the consular agents were convinced that if the alien were permitted to come to American shores he would not at a later date of necessity be supported by the American taxpayers.

In that connection I wish to say that those regulations were carried out to the satisfaction of those who sought admission to our gates until 2 years ago when the refugees of the world attempted to crash our gates. I mentioned some instances a moment ago when refugees who are members of professions from across the seas said they would not abide by the rules and regulations of the New York licensing board, but that they would take the cases up to the Supreme Court of the United States.

I now bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that we are at this hour faced with the situation of aliens in various countries of the world exerting pressure on our State Department to instruct American consuls that they should be more liberal in reviewing the applications of the thousands upon thousands of aliens who would bring about the admission of themselves into this country for the purpose of competing with American labor.

Mr. President, when last fall, in November and December, I was in central, eastern, and continental Europe I made it a point to visit our Embassies, Legations, and consulates; I made it a point to talk to the American representatives; I made it a point to go into those quarters of our consulates and Embassies where aliens who were making applications for visas and admission to the United States necessarily had to go. I was permitted an opportunity of making observation of the character of the people who were demanding entrance to the United States. I learned on that trip last fall that the State Department of the United States had attempted to put a different interpretation than that which had formerly been put upon the law. As a result thereof, in order to deal with the situation as I should like to do in behalf of the from ten to twelve million God-fearing, unfortunate men and women in this country who are out of employment, I directed a communication to the State Department and requested them to provide me with the information which I sought in reference to certain instructions which had been issued to our consular agents abroad. As the result, at this hour I call the attention of the Senate to what I am about to read, because I wanted from them an answer.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 19, 1939.

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I have received your letter of January 16, 1939, requesting a copy of the instruction dated January 5, 1937, sent to all diplomatic and consular officers discussing the public charge excluding provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

While the Department does not distribute its instructions to the general public, I am glad to comply with your request and take pleasure in sending to you herewith a copy of the instruction under reference.

Sincerely yours,

G. S. MESSERSMITH,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, please listen to this "visa instruction," dated January 5, 1937. That is when the rush began on the part of the aliens of the world to enter the United States of America.

VISA INSTRUCTION

Consular administration of the public charge and other provisions of the immigration laws.

It is addressed:

To American diplomatic and consular officers:

Sins: There have been an increasing number of complaints received by the Department and some recent public criticism that the visa work of the consuls is not being carried on in a fair and impartial manner.

Who is making the complaints? The complaints are being made by the hundreds of thousands of aliens who are practically demanding admission to the United States of America. Ten years prior to the date of the instructions we never had any complaint from aliens about the way we administered our laws and in carrying out the immigration regulations of the United States of America, but these complaints come only when the rush begins to enter the United States so that more Americans may be thrown out of work.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Has the Senator from North Carolina any figures available indicating the number of aliens who have entered the United States illegally in recent years?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I can only answer that by providing the Senator with an estimate of my personal opinion as to the number of aliens who are in the United States today illegally and who have remained here illegally over a term of years. In providing that answer I wish to say that, in my opinion, there are today in the United States of America between 5,000,000 and 7,000,000 aliens who entered here illegally or who have remained within the confines of the United States illegally. No Member of this body, no man in the United States, can properly prove that I am wrong, because I cannot prove that I am right. [Laughter.] To explain that remark, so that I may not be misunderstood, I say now I cannot prove that those who disagree with my assertion that there are from 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 aliens in the United States today illegally and who maintain that there are only two, three, or four million aliens illegally in the United States are wrong, and they cannot prove that I am wrong. Why? Because, I am ashamed to state, ours is the only nation in the world not possessed or provided with an alien registration act. Until the Congress shall pass a bill which I have introduced calling for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens, we will never know how many aliens there are in America.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield now to my distinguished colleague from the Lone Star State of Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the discussion of the Senator from North Carolina. Let me ask him if there are so many aliens here—and I do not dispute it—why do not the authorities deport them? If they are here illegally, why do not the Government agencies which are charged with the duty of sending them back to wherever they came from take action?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is what I have been trying to find out for the past 5 years. Mr. President, upon the floor of the Senate I have fought for days and days and hours and hours when an effort was made to pass a bill which, in my opinion, would let down the floodgates of immigration. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], who at the moment presides so ably and in such a distinguished manner over the Senate, will recall that at the last session we discussed upon the floor of the Senate more than 2,300 cases known as hardship cases, and I could not understand, for the life of me, why the aliens in those cases were not deported and why even now they are being held here from day to day and week to week and month to month and year to year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets that he has to tell the able Senator from North Carolina that his time has about expired, as he has only a half minute remaining.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Then, Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to be permitted to finish the reading of the document I had started to read, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A unanimous-consent request can be made by the Senator and the Senate can act upon it. The Senator from North Carolina tenders a request

that he have unanimous consent to conclude the reading of the document to which he refers. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Chair and the Senate for their courtesy.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to read without comment, for I know how vitally interested my colleagues are in this subject; I know that they all, on this side as well as on the other side, are interested in providing work for Americans and in keeping out of this country those who would usurp American jobs. So, in view of the courtesy extended to me and the fine consideration I find here always, I shall read without comment.

Sms: There have been an increasing number of complaints received by the Department and some recent public criticism that the visa work of the consuls is not being carried on in a fair and impartial manner, particularly that the public-charge provisions are not being properly administered and that the consuls are acting under the mistaken idea that they are responsible for keeping the issuance of visas to a minimum.

The immigration policy as expressed by Congress in the Immigration Act of 1924 permits the issuance of immigration visas, within the limits of the quotas, to aliens reasonably able to meet the requirements of the law.

The officers' responsibility is to reach a correct decision in each case, based upon a fair evaluation of the evidence, viewed with practical common sense, in order that the decisions reached shall not be subject to just criticism. As administrative officers, the consuls are charged with the duty of developing the essential facts, favorable as well as unfavorable to the alien, and of applying to the facts the correct standard of the law. To do their work properly, they should maintain at all times an impartial, detached, judicial attitude.

The applicant should be courteously received and given helpful advice and proper assistance in presenting the facts in his case. Care should be taken to avoid cause for the complaint which has been made in specific cases that persons applying for visas have been discourteously received by members of the consular staff; that they have not been permitted to present their documents or discuss their cases; that after complying with certain requirements they have been met with demands for additional documents of which they could have been advised in the first instance; and that they have been put to needless inconvenience and expense in obtaining unnecessary documentary evidence. Consular letters have failed to refer to and discuss important evidence, giving the impression that such evidence has been ignored in reaching the decision, and that the decision has not been taken upon the basis of all the evidence presented.

It is important for a consular officer to understand that the public-charge provisions of the law exclude persons "likely" to become a public charge; that is, persons in whose cases facts exist making it "probable" that they will become public charges. The law does not exclude persons who may "possibly" become public charges. Section 23 of the act of 1924, in placing the burden of proof upon an alien to show that he is not subject to exclusion, only requires him to bring forward evidence from which it may reasonably be concluded that he is not "likely" to become a public charge. He is not required to show a guaranty of support to obviate a "possibility" that he may become a public charge. An understanding of this distinction is of the greatest importance to the correct administration of the public-charge clause. Unless each case is decided upon the basis of the "probabilities," improper administration results, and applicants reasonably able to qualify under the law are unjustly refused visas to which they are entitled. Such action affords ground for just criticism of the officers and the Department.

Visa refusals of persons whose assurance of support is furnished by distant relatives in the United States have caused considerable adverse comment because consular officers have considered that the expression of willingness by a person to support a less near relative is insufficient to establish that he is not likely to become a public charge unless a case is made out by a showing of past material contribution to his support or the existence of very unusual circumstances. Letters have contained statements to the effect that visas have been refused because the relationship between the persons is not sufficiently close to imply the existence of a legal or moral obligation on the part of the affiant toward the applicant. The mere fact that a person promising support is not closely related to the applicant, or that he is not under a legal or moral obligation toward him is not sufficient to warrant the rejection of the evidence of support as inadequate. The relative, in furnishing the evidence, has in effect said that in spite of the absence of any direct obligation on his part to support his less near relative, he nevertheless desires voluntarily to undertake such an obligation, and if he offers reasonable explanation of his desire to do so and is financially able, the evidence is to be accepted.

The conditions in certain parts of the world have led relatives in the United States to feel keenly the difficult lot of their kin abroad and have inspired them with anxiety for the well-being of their relatives and with a desire to provide for them. A statement by a financially responsible person in the United States that he is impelled by this motive to assist a relative, even though he may not

previously have seen him or have had occasion previously to contribute to his support, in the absence of adequate reason for doubting its sincerity, may well be sufficient to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that it is not "likely" that the alien will become a public charge. To reject such evidence as insufficient upon a hypothesis as, for instance, that disagreement might arise between the alien and his relative, or that the relative while inclined to assist the applicant for an initial period may not continue the support, would be to base the decision upon the "possibilities" in the case rather than upon the "probabilities" and would constitute a failure to give the evidence due weight.

The consul should look behind the formal evidence to seek the essential facts. He may, to the extent deemed necessary, properly ask to have the facts established by appropriate evidence, a statement of plans made for the alien, and the reasons for assuming the alien's support.

You are requested to bring this instruction to the immediate attention of all the officers at your office engaged in visa work and to direct them to follow the principles set forth herein to insure that the immigration laws shall be fairly and reasonably administered at your office in a manner to avoid just cause for complaint. At the same time the Department desires to impress upon the principal officers that they are primarily responsible for the proper performance of the visa work at their respective offices and that they should recognize its importance and closely supervise it.

Very truly yours,

WILBUR J. CARR,
For the Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I regret that I find it necessary to consume any of the time of the Senate. I know that it is presumptuous on my part, as a new Member, to participate in this debate; but some of the charges which have been made have been so broad and general in character and scope as to apply either directly or indirectly to the great State which I have the honor in part to represent in this body.

Mr. President, I desire to say to you that the W. P. A., so far as its being a political issue is concerned, never entered our senatorial campaign. I wish to say for my State that only 11 complaints were lodged with the Sheppard committee pertaining to the activities of W. P. A.; but, upon investigation, every one of the charges was dismissed. In one congressional district, however, in the State of New York, the issue was raised, and all of the charges that have been aired in this debate, common to the general political charges made against W. P. A. all over the Nation, were brought to the attention of the public, and finally to the attention of a Federal grand jury. These charges were presented to the official instrumentality of government created at the very beginning of the Republic to delve into matters of this character and to aid in the preservation of law and order. Charges against the N. Y. A., the Adult Education Agency, the sewing project, all were investigated and dismissed by the Federal grand jury.

Some Members of the Senate may desire to know something about the character of the grand jury and the character of the proceedings. Let me say to you, Mr. President, that the charges were made by an opposition candidate for Member of Congress. The grand jury was organized, and selected as its chairman an outstanding Republican leader in our section of the State. Every member of the grand jury save one, I am informed, was identified with the Republican Party. The presiding judge himself over a long period of years antedating my entry into politics, over a quarter of a century ago, was an outstanding leader of the Republican Party.

Every opportunity was given to every witness, and a thorough and searching examination was made by the jury of all the communications, instructions, orders and letters germane to the subject of the investigation. The grand jury made this presentment, which I shall read to you only in part.

Quoting the grand jury's presentment, I read:

We wish to report that the investigation conducted by us has been full, complete, and exhaustive.

Now, the only Democrat who participated in the investigation was the United States district attorney; and the grand jury make this comment with regard to his conduct:

The United States district attorney, at the very beginning of the proceeding, offered to subpoena and produce any witnesses that we thought might be material, and thereafter, by subpoena, did produce every such witness and many others.

And the grand jury goes on in its presentment as follows:

It has been charged that the W. P. A. workers were forced to contribute to the Democratic Party; that W. P. A. superintendents had distributed pledge cards among the workers; that certain W. P. A. employees were "singled out for special attention after they had refused to contribute"; that certain employees "who, after pledging only \$1 or \$2, were directed to report at Democratic headquarters." * * *

Witnesses were produced by J. Francis Harter, who testified in regard to alleged irregularities involving the adult-education program, a W. P. A.-sponsored project.

After a thorough investigation * * * of the charges affecting the adult education program, we have determined—

Said the grand jury—

that they are unworthy of attention.

Certain other witnesses testified in regard to irregularities in connection with the sewing project, so-called.

After investigation by the grand jury, it was determined that the charges affecting the sewing project were not substantiated.

Then the grand jury goes on as follows:

It has been testified to, in the course of our deliberations, that on the 5th day of May 1938, Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator of the Works Progress Administration, addressed a communication to all project workers, foremen, supervisors, and the administrative staff of the W. P. A. Among other things, he wrote:

And I quote from the letter:

Moreover, no W. P. A. worker is required—

Said Hopkins—

to contribute to any political party or any campaign fund, in order to hold his job.

And Harry Hopkins said further in that communication, which, I understand, was directed to every W. P. A. administrator in this country:

No supervisor or administrative person may attempt to influence the vote of any worker or solicit contributions to campaign funds from the people who work under him. Anyone who uses his position with the W. P. A. in any way to influence the votes of others by threat or intimidation will be dismissed. No one will lose his W. P. A. job because of his vote * * *

And everybody knows that Harry Hopkins said that—

or his failure to contribute to any campaign fund. This has always been an absolute rule of the W. P. A.

That is the end of the quotation from the letter addressed to W. P. A. directors by Harry L. Hopkins, and in part contained in this presentment of the Federal grand jury.

The grand jury then goes on to state:

The letter was placed in the pay envelope of all the men and workers on W. P. A. It was a letter even stupid people could understand. It was a letter superintendents, skilled workers, and laborers could understand. It was a letter written to protect the skilled workers and laborers.

Those letters, I understand, were sent out broadcast throughout the United States, wherever a W. P. A. project was in course of construction.

Then this grand jury, Senators, made up, with but one exception, of affiliates of the Republican Party, investigating thoroughly, completely, and exhaustively the activities of Harry L. Hopkins and the political charges made by a Republican candidate, summed up their presentment with this language:

We have commended Harry L. Hopkins, Lester W. Herzog—

The State director—

and Guy W. Rice—

The regional director.

And they go on to say:

Obviously, as Mr. Hopkins has said, "Only by continuing to do a good job for the public can we expect continued public approval." Part of the good job is a nonpartisan administration of the W. P. A. We recommend an increased devotion to such nonpartisan administration.

Mr. President, I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Harry Hopkins because, by and large, in a new field, pioneering a new endeavor, he did a fine job. I am not impressed with the charges which have been presented here this afternoon, and I wish to sum them up by saying they were political.

I shall vote for the confirmation of Harry Hopkins' nomination because this body had an opportunity by its own action to write its own rule, and it failed at the time to do so, and contents itself at this time with finding fault with a man who adhered to every rule we laid down for his conduct, and even went further than that, and, in my judgment, enforced a non-partisan rule to which few can take exception.

I think Harry Hopkins did a fine job; and the vote he will receive this afternoon will, in my judgment, evidence the high regard in which he is held by this body and by the country.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, during the course of my remarks last Thursday, and in response to questions of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I stated that I differed with the findings of the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenses on one point. I have been making a consistent study of this problem for 4 years. I have great respect for the committee, and I am satisfied that when it continues this investigation, it will find the facts as they have presented themselves to me.

I believe that Mr. Hopkins has had full opportunity to acquaint himself with the administrative problems of work relief in Pennsylvania, and that he knows full well what they are. I do not believe he could justifiably claim to be ignorant of them. I say now, as I said last Thursday, that I should not care to indict his intelligence in that way.

I have had considerable correspondence with Mr. Hopkins, which shows that for a long period of time I have been calling his attention to voter coercion and the mismanagement of public funds in Pennsylvania. I have consistently sought cooperation from him in trying to remedy these conditions. Just as consistently, he refused to give me the help I had a right to expect.

For the information of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and others who may be interested, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the following correspondence: My letter to Mr. Hopkins of March 19, 1936; my statement to the Senate Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on April 2, 1936; my letter to Mr. Hopkins of September 30, 1936; my letter to Senator AUGUSTINE LONERGAN of September 30, 1936; my letter to Mr. Hopkins of December 29, 1936; letter of Mr. Hopkins to me of January 18, 1937; my letter to Mr. Hopkins of January 19, 1937; my letter to Mr. Hopkins of May 26, 1937; my letter to Mr. Hopkins of July 2, 1937; and letter of Mr. Hopkins to me of July 14, 1937.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 19, 1936.

Mr. HARRY HOPKINS,
Administrator, the Works Progress Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOPKINS: I have read your statement carried by the Associated Press in which you say: "No employee of the Works Progress Administration, either administrative or engaged on a project, is required to make any contribution to any political party. No Works Progress Administration employee's job will be in jeopardy because of the failure of said employee to make such contribution. No employee of the Works Progress Administration shall at any time solicit contributions for any political party, and evidence of such solicitation will be cause for immediate discharge. The question of whether or not to contribute to any political party is a matter entirely for the voluntary decision of said employee. No person shall be employed or discharged by the Works Progress Administration on the ground of his support or nonsupport of any candidate of any political organization."

I believe this to be a step in the right direction. However, it is only one of a number of decisive actions which, in my judgment, should be taken if relief is to be kept out of politics in the future. Unfortunately, conditions have been allowed to develop to such an extent and the difficulty of control of the national organization of the W. P. A. from Washington is so great that no mere statement of policy such as you have made, sincere and thoroughgoing as it doubtless is, can solve this problem.

My approach to this question has been governed very largely by the definite statements made by those in authority that they desired relief kept out of politics. On April 28, 1935, President Roosevelt said: "The most effective means of preventing such evils in this work-relief program will be the eternal vigilance of the American people themselves. I call upon my fellow citizens everywhere to cooperate with me in making this most efficient and the cleanest example of public enterprise the world has ever seen."

It is time to provide a smashing answer for those cynics who say that a democracy cannot be honest and efficient. If you will help, this can be done. I therefore hope you will watch the work in every corner of this Nation. Feel free to criticize. Tell me of instances where work can be done better or where improper practices prevail. Neither you nor I want criticism in a purely fault-finding or partisan spirit, but I am jealous of the right of every citizen to call to the attention of his or her Government examples of how the public money can be more effectively spent for the benefit of the American people." This statement, coupled with your own as quoted above, indicates a desire for honest, efficient administration which is to be admired.

However, statements of this sort are not sufficient to insure the desired results. Evidence of waste, partisan use of W. P. A. funds, and needless red tape is found on every hand. Without solicitation of any kind, letters have come to me from all over the country revealing a state of affairs which in many instances is positively vicious. I can cite example after example of wicked practice, such as is found in the case of a Republican W. P. A. supervisor with a wife and seven children dependent upon him, replaced by a Democrat with but two persons dependent upon him, for no reason other than partisan issues. These are not isolated cases. Situations of this kind prevail all over the country. You have doubtless read the account given by Mr. Johnson, formerly State supervisor of the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania, in the last issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Certainly conditions as reported by Mr. Johnson in the State of Pennsylvania cannot be corrected simply by dictating an office memo.

I have asked for a full and complete investigation of the Works Progress Administration for the following reasons:

1. Taxpayers are justified in asking a businesslike statement in detail of the various uses for which the billions of dollars already appropriated are being spent.

2. No such detailed statement showing the names, number, or salaries of employees has been made available to the newspapers or public generally, although this is public business and should be treated as such.

3. Evidence already in hand points indisputably to the fact that relief money, in many instances, is being spent for partisan and political appointments contrary to the purpose for which work-relief appropriations were made. Without an investigation no person can estimate the extent of this evil. Those who administer these funds have repeatedly declared that they desire to keep relief out of politics. They should welcome this investigation, for it will help them to accomplish the efficient administration of their task. Taxpayers have the right to know how their money is being spent, and the only way this can be determined is through an investigation.

4. Attempts on the part of the work-relief administrative authorities to investigate their own organization problems have not solved them and could not solve them. The extension of work-relief administrative authority is so vast, so much money and so many people are involved, that taxpayers are warranted in asking for a senatorial investigation, as in the case of all other matters pertaining to the public welfare. Charges of abuses will multiply until an impartial investigation is made. This would be particularly unfortunate during a national-election year.

5. There is no necessity to give undue publicity to the ordinary routine of work-relief administration. The names and salaries of workers in the lower brackets need not be made public. However, all information whatsoever pertaining to the administration of work-relief funds should be made available to a Senate investigating committee. Publicity should be given only through the ordinary channels in regular committee hearings.

6. The work-relief budget for the coming year, asking for an additional \$1,500,000,000, has just been placed before Congress. Taxpayers are justified in knowing how previous appropriations have been spent before authority is delegated to make new expenditures without congressional counsel or appropriate legislation. I favor work-relief appropriations. I have voted for them consistently. I favor additional appropriations. However, I believe the people of this country are justified in asking how much money has been spent in the past, how it has been spent, and how it may be spent in the future to the greatest advantage of the Nation. Information, acceptable to all concerned, can be obtained only through an impartial investigation under present circumstances.

The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which my resolution was referred and of which I am a member, reported favorably on the resolution today. This committee, if authorized to make such an investigation, would be expected to report its findings to the Senate as soon as possible, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

In view of your statement to the press, which points in the right direction, would it not be helpful to set up nonpartisan citizens' committees in every State, county, city, and governmental unit where W. P. A. workers are employed who would have power to pass on work-relief administrative appointments in order to assure that they are nonpartisan in character? Such committees could also serve as a clearing house for troubles and complaints which cannot secure satisfactory settlement through the ordinary channels of W. P. A. administrative authority. I believe that a plan such as this, coupled with other suggestions which I have in mind, would do much to make practical your expressed desire to keep relief out of politics.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES J. DAVIS TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE, APRIL 2, 1936

When I first asked for an investigation of the Works Progress Administration I had but one thought in mind. I desired to get the names and salaries of W. P. A. workers in the upper brackets, whose income was \$100 a month or above. These would be primarily those who were doing administrative work. In order to get this information which I had asked for and which had not been obtained, I suggested an appropriation of \$5,000.

I realized, of course, that other Senate investigations were costing all the way from \$50,000 to \$100,000. But when I asked for \$5,000 I had only in mind the expense which might attach to securing the list of names for which I had asked.

Since this first suggestion was made so many new developments have come to my attention that I now see that this investigation will cost far more than that. In the first place, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has asked that an investigation of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration be added to the investigation of the Works Progress Administration. This was not my request, but I agreed to it.

When word went out over the country that there was prospect of an investigation letters came to me from all over the country telling of conditions in the W. P. A. which, if thoroughly examined, would mean an investigation of the Works Progress Administration in every State in the Union. Such an investigation, if once begun, would have to be completed. It would cost all the way from \$100,000 to \$250,000. At least \$50,000 would be necessary with which to begin. I wish to say emphatically that I desire to have no part in an investigation which is abortive. If a thoroughgoing investigation is to be made, I want to be sure that it is actually what it purports to be. The purpose of such an investigation should not be either to smear anyone or to whitewash anyone, but actually to discover conditions as they are so that information may be made available for the proper regulation of work-relief activities in the future.

We were plunged into work-relief activities in a hurry. The administrative set-up was formed to meet an emergency. We now see that what was said to be an emergency represents a condition which promises to be with us for some time. Work relief is now with us on more or less permanent basis. In view of these facts, we cannot afford to treat abuses as though they will disappear of their own accord in the near future. We do not know how long work relief will be necessary. We do know that at the present time more money is being spent in this way than in any other governmental agency. With the expenditure of so much money there comes an inevitable responsibility to safeguard the administration of these funds no matter in whose hands they are entrusted.

If work relief lasts for years to come we cannot begin too soon to examine ways and means to discover how the taxpayers who foot this bill can get the most for their money. Obviously, we have come to the time when work relief can no longer be continued on an emergency or experimental basis.

The Audit Committee will have to determine whether a thoroughgoing investigation is desired or something less searching. In the beginning I asked for \$5,000 in order that the names and salaries of administrative officers in the upper brackets, above \$100 a month, might be secured and an investigation begun in the State of Pennsylvania as was suggested by Senator LEWIS, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I am prepared to proceed with a thoroughgoing investigation if it is authorized by the Senate, but again I wish to make clear my belief that such an investigation will cost upward of \$100,000 and I do not wish to begin an investigation and then later on be compelled to abandon it for lack of necessary funds. If a full and complete investigation of the W. P. A. and F. E. R. A. is to be made, I wish to be sure that it is conducted on a scale commensurate with its importance to American taxpayers. If only \$5,000 is to be appropriated, I should like to have distinctly understood that this amount will be used only for the limited purpose for which it was asked.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1936.

MR. HARRY HOPKINS,
Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOPKINS: Pennsylvania is aflame today with rumors and gossip regarding the waste and partisanship of relief administration. Regardless of the outcome of the election, such talk is exceedingly harmful to the thousands of defenseless men, women, and children who are dependent on Government aid. They have been needlessly humiliated. They have been brought to the attention of the public in the worst possible way because of the secrecy in which the administration of funds for their aid has been maintained leading to charges of politics in relief. It is now currently charged that no man on a relief or work-relief roll dare vote against the present administration. It is charged that the W. P. A. has developed into the most gigantic political machine this country has ever known. It is charged that only 63 cents out of every work-relief dollar gets to the man on the work-relief job. The public does not know the truth of these matters, because by your refusal to cooperate with those who asked repeatedly for an impartial investigation of the W. P. A. you acted as though you were the work-relief czar and in effect said, "The public be damned."

Today I am writing Senator AUGUSTINE LONERGAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenses, urging that the committee obtain from you a full list of the names, addresses, and salaries of all administrative officers, political appointees, and foremen on the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania.

I addressed a series of requests to you asking for information as to the administrative personnel of the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania. I made clear that I did not wish the names of those subsisting on relief in the lower brackets. To date I have not received the information requested, although a fractional part of one list came to my office. I was informed that the clerical labor involved in the compilation of the information for which I asked occasioned the delay.

Would it be possible for you to imagine yourself on a work-relief roll?

Put yourself just for a moment in the place of a helpless victim of this depression. Once perhaps you were making \$5,000 a year and all seemed well and secure with you. Then came financial losses, unemployment, and dire distress for yourself and your family.

The only way to get bread under such circumstances for yourself and dependents would be the prospect of a work-relief job, which would pay you as a white-collar worker \$93.50 a month. But under the ruling so long in effect under which millions of American citizens came upon home-relief rolls, you could apply for that job only after you had declared yourself destitute—in effect, a pauper—for this was for years the ruling of the Works Progress Administration.

First, you would go on home relief rolls, and finally, in many instances, synthetic work would be arranged for you on a work relief roll. For months you would read in the newspapers that every person on relief is expected to vote for the New Deal. You would gradually be led to believe this to be the unwritten law of the administration. You would come to know that when you signed up on relief you had signed away your electoral rights in the eyes of the public, no matter how earnestly you might assure yourself silently to the contrary. In the eyes of your fellows you would be one of the many millions who had sold his vote to the New Deal for starvation wages.

Then you would see the red-white-and-blue signs stuck up on your job to let the public know that the Works Progress Administration is advertising itself. Your W. P. A. associates would furnish you with information as to how you might expect a promotion if you were willing to change your political registration. As the campaign came on you would be asked to wear campaign buttons, badges, and insignia put out by the Democratic National Committee. If you refused to wear this insignia or to subscribe to "We the People," someone might question your right to eat at public expense.

All the time you would be hating the relentless machine which gradually sought to undermine your character, deny your individuality, and demand that you become another "yes man" for the New Deal. This, Mr. Hopkins, is what the Works Progress Administration under your leadership means for thousands of men and women in this country.

By your refusal to cooperate with those who wanted to take the stigma off of the Works Progress Administration you helped to build the public mind against the man on relief.

Again I wish to request that you cooperate with those who are trying to take politics out of relief. I hope that you will give to the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenses the full list of names, addresses, and salaries of administrative officials, political appointees, and foremen in the State of Pennsylvania, so that the public may be informed, as it has a right to be, concerning the conduct of governmental business. Is it too much to ask that this information be made ready within 15 days, so that voters may have sufficient time to become acquainted with the facts?

If the charges made against the W. P. A. are false, it should bring you satisfaction to prove them so, for the reelection of the President now seems partially contingent on this issue. If the charges made are true, the repression of this information will work a lasting damage to the American people, for which they will have a right to hold you fully accountable under the law.

I hope that the public may have the facts within 15 days.

Sincerely,

SEPTEMBER 30, 1936.

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LONERGAN: I wish to thank you for the opportunity you gave me to appear before the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenses in executive session. Your evident desire to uphold our electoral laws and secure fair play for all heartens me. I wish you and the committee every success in your work to maintain just and fair electoral conditions.

Perhaps you will understand how very much I dislike continually to be raising the question of relief in its political aspects. Conditions have forced these matters to my attention for many months and I have made every effort to have this issue taken out of the realm of gossip and rumor into the impartial light of a legally constituted committee. During the last session of Congress I asked repeatedly that a full and complete investigation of the W. P. A. should be made and the question of politics in relief be settled by a Senate committee so that it would not be kicked around as a political football in the campaign, as is now the case. My recent appearance before your committee was the first time that I have been permitted to present this problem to any committee having

authority to act upon it. I now hope that that constructive action will be taken immediately, as the public is entitled to all the facts relating to this issue.

Those who administer the W. P. A. have consistently stated that there is no politics in relief. Mr. Hopkins time and again made this statement and to my knowledge has never retracted it. He was content to issue orders forbidding such action to be posted on W. P. A. bulletin boards and to prevent the public from learning the results of investigations of the W. P. A. made by his own subordinates. I wrote to Mr. Hopkins a number of letters, beginning in February, asking for a list of the names, addresses, and salaries of all political appointees, administrative heads, and foremen of the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania. His assistants replied to my letters but it was many weeks before I received a very small portion of the list for which I had asked. To date my request is still unanswered. The clerical labor involved in preparing the list was advanced as a reason for delay.

In the face of the tremendous amount of rumor which is going the rounds regarding the political aspects of the W. P. A., it must appear obvious that the administration has now more to gain from a respectful hearing of the evidence in these matters than by a continuation of a policy of repression.

I voted for the various relief and work-relief measures and I expect to be asked to vote on kindred measures in the next session of Congress, irrespective of the outcome of the November election. Relief and work relief will be continued. Right-thinking men will insist that it be carried on in a nonpartisan way and that those who receive this aid will not be compelled to stultify themselves by abandoning their individual electoral rights.

I have been censured for voting for relief measures and giving aid to programs out of which has been developed a gigantic political machine now being used to throttle the electorate and to oppose all who differ with it. Today I realize that nothing will so surely deprive needy people of the relief to which they are justly entitled as the waste and partisanship which now attends its administration. I have hoped to stand for the rights of the victims of this depression during this administration, and in the next should there be a change. In event of a Republican victory at the polls this year, I wish to be free to continue to uphold the rights of the needy unemployed.

In the last analysis the only justification of voting appropriations for relief is the distress of defenseless men, women, and children. No one should starve in the midst of plenty. Those who seek to make political capital and create fat jobs for themselves out of human misery deserve to have the full light of publicity directed upon them. They cannot stand before the reproach of public opinion. I would not wish to believe that the President would be willing at this time to attempt to shield these for the sake of political advantage.

I suggest that you ask Mr. Hopkins to provide your committee with the names, addresses, and salaries of all administrative employees on the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania; all foremen, and all political appointees, particularly in western Pennsylvania and Allegheny County, so that this information may be made public. I am not asking for publicity to be given to the names and addresses of unfortunate men and women who in their distress have been driven upon relief rolls and who are now subsisting at an income level which Americans generally have been taught to regard as starvation wages.

Knowing that you are consistent within yourself and have a long and honorable record of public service and that you desire good government to prevail, I am making this request of you and your committee. I have tried to obtain this information from Mr. Hopkins, but without success. As a result, the issue has been thrown into the heat of a political campaign. I believe that Mr. Hopkins will recognize the right of your committee to subpoena data from his office, if necessary, and that he will give you the cooperation he has refused me. In event that Mr. Hopkins withholds this information from the public, I suggest that you ask the President for it.

I need not inform you that the request which I have made to Mr. Hopkins is entirely in keeping with the traditional rights of taxpayers who call for reports on public business and the obligations which bind those who hold public office. The administrative work of the W. P. A. is public business and its personnel should be held just as strictly accountable to taxpayers as regularly elected officials. If this is not true, we must then conclude that the W. P. A. represents a usurpation of public authority entirely inconsistent with the American plan of government. What mayor of any American city could refuse to publish the names, addresses, and salaries of those on the public pay roll?

Rumor has it that there are more bosses, foremen, administrative officials on the W. P. A. in Allegheny County than are required to service any one of the largest industrial firms in the State of Pennsylvania. If this be true, taxpayers have a right to know the facts.

I need not repeat what I said before your committee as to my lifelong position regarding political coercion. I can conceive of nothing more despicable than for any powerful organization, be it industry or government, to attempt to destroy the individual political rights of those on its pay rolls. During a long experience in Pennsylvania I have from time to time heard charges of voter coercion. I dare say that there is a measure of truth in these statements, although as a millworker I had no personal knowledge of such conditions. No one has ever attempted to deprive me of my electoral right. Observation of steel workers and coal miners leads me to believe that they are so independent in action that at-

tempts to force their vote would bring just the opposite action on their part. There were charges of voter coercion in 1932. A survey of industrial centers, South Pittsburgh, Farrell, and other districts populated with workers will show that these people voted as they pleased at that time. I believe they will vote as they think best today.

I enclose copies of two letters I have received, reserving the names of those who signed them for your committee, lest their public use bring undesired trouble to those who have volunteered this startling information. The letters will give your committee but a slight idea of the charges which are now current regarding politics in work relief in the State of Pennsylvania.

Again, I wish to express my appreciation of the courtesy extended to me by your committee. It is my firm belief that if all who have had to do with the conduct of this great public responsibility had fulfilled this trust with an eye single to the welfare of the people as with you, there would not now be incessant demand for an investigation of these charges.

Most cordially yours,

DECEMBER 29, 1936.

MR. HARRY HOPKINS,
Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOPKINS: Now that the campaign is over I am continuing my request initiated almost a year ago that the names, addresses, salaries, and positions of the entire administrative personnel of the W. P. A. throughout the country be made available to all authorized representatives of public opinion and taxpayers. As United States Senator from Pennsylvania I ask especially for this information regarding this State.

This request was made early last spring, but your office did not make the data available. I continued time and again to make this request long before the campaign got under way. Not heeding it, you made it a campaign issue, but publicly stated that my sole interest in the matter was political. The campaign is over, but I am still asking for this information, and, representing the constituents of my State, I shall continue to ask for it until the ordinary routine of justice and fair play in the handling of public money in your office is achieved.

I have made it thoroughly clear that I am not asking for the names and addresses of every one on relief, but only those of the administrative personnel. This information should be made public just as in the case of your salary and mine and others on governmental pay rolls. We now witness the circumstance of the publication of the administrative personnel salaries of private business concerns through the Federal Trade Commission, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Social Security Commission, etc., while the same sort of information is denied the authorized representatives of the public by your office. I know this to be true in Pennsylvania.

If you choose to ignore this request as you have done in the past, I shall have no other recourse than to introduce a resolution in the Senate again asking for this data. I should much prefer to have the information directly from you. Your cooperation in this respect would show that you desire to rid this issue of politics.

Sincerely yours,

WORK PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1937.

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: This will acknowledge your letter of December 29 in which you request that the names, addresses, salaries, and positions of the entire administrative personnel of the Works Progress Administration in Pennsylvania be made available to all authorized representatives of public opinion and taxpayers.

As I indicated previously on several occasions, I have felt that the public might have and should have a very real interest in the methods of operation of this Administration, the amount spent for administrative expenses of various kinds, including the salary grades and the total amount of salaries in each grade. I can also see a legitimate interest in the public's knowing the salaries of the major officers who are responsible for the formulation and execution of the policies of the administration. I cannot, however, see how it could have a legitimate interest in the individual salaries and addresses of the many hundreds of employees performing minor clerical functions.

This principle seems to me to have been well recognized by Congress, when in 1925 it passed an act directing the Director of the Census to continue to compile the Federal Register and restricting this register to persons occupying supervisory and administrative positions in the executive and judicial departments of the Government. Under this act it has been the practice to publish only the names, addresses, and salaries of those officials who are responsible for formulation of policies of the various bureaus or who supervise major portions of the work. This position has, I believe, been concurred in for many years by the heads of the various executive departments who have, according to my understanding, refused to give out information of the type which you request.

I am perfectly willing to make available to the public the names and salaries of the major officers of this administration in Pennsylvania or any other State. I am not willing to make public names, salaries, or addresses of the clerical employees since I firmly believe, as stated above, that the public can have no legitimate interest in this information and its publication would only

subject these employees, who are receiving only small compensation, to the gossip of neighbors and the pressure of commercial and political salesmen.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY L. HOPKINS,
Administrator.

JANUARY 19, 1937.

HON. HARRY HOPKINS,

Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOPKINS: Your letter of January 18 in response to my letter to you of December 29 is at hand.

Your reply in which you say, "I cannot, however, see how it could have a legitimate interest in the individual salaries and addresses of the many hundreds of employees performing minor clerical functions" led me to examine the file of letters I have written you during the last year. In each of these letters, if you will trouble yourself to examine them, you will find that I have at no time asked for a list of W. P. A. "performing minor clerical functions."

I have insistently asked for the names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all administrative officials, which includes investigators, foremen, project supervisors, managers, and assistants, etc. These people may not be paid salaries of more than \$93.50 a month, but they exert political influence, and that, Mr. Hopkins, is what we are talking about.

I am not asking you for a list of actors, architects, draftsmen, artists, sculptors, teachers of art, librarians, musicians, teachers of music, playground workers, writers, editors, bookkeepers, accountants, auditors, statistical editors, enumerators, stenographers, typists, blacksmiths, bricklayers, stonemasons, carpenters, cement finishers, electricians, painters, plasterers, etc.

Let me again state that I wish the names, addresses, salaries, and positions of W. P. A. and F. E. R. A. and other relief organizations you have had in charge during the last 4 years, all administrative personnel which includes Administrators, State administrators, project supervisors, foremen, managers, inspectors, investigators, and their assistants. These people possess political power, and it is the use made of their political authority which is now called in question.

You say that you are "perfectly willing to make available to the public the names and salaries of the major officers of this administration in Pennsylvania or any other State." In keeping with the policy which you say you have adopted, I wish to ask you to make public the names and salaries of all administrative officials, for all of them have to do with the formulation of the political policy of your administration.

I am asking you, and let me repeat it, for the names, addresses, salaries, and positions of all the administrative personnel of the W. P. A. and F. E. R. A., and other relief organizations which you have had in charge during the last 4 years, to include the names of administrators, assistant administrators, State supervisors, project supervisors, investigators, foremen, managers, and the assistants of all these, together with all others whom the taxpayers will wish questioned when they are called to give an account of the money spent during the last 4 years at your direction.

Formerly you have protested that the clerical work necessary to compile these lists would prove a tax upon your staff. In order to avoid any too great burden upon you, permit me to suggest that lists be compiled first in the State of Pennsylvania and that reputable newspapers be allowed through their representatives to have access to the files so that they may compile the lists which otherwise might prove too difficult a task for you and your associates. After the State of Pennsylvania has thus been covered, the findings may suggest the possibility of the worth of further proceedings in other States. My mail would indicate this, but I am willing to wait, pending what is found out in Pennsylvania.

You say, "I am perfectly willing to make available to the public the names and salaries of the major officers of this administration in Pennsylvania or any other State." I believe, Mr. Hopkins, this is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step. In keeping with this policy I wish to ask that you follow it through in a thoroughgoing way. I ask you to give authority for representative news agencies of the taxpayers to ascertain immediately the names and salaries of all administrative personnel as above indicated, for all of them have had to do with the formulation of the political policy of your administration, and it is the politics of your administration, Mr. Hopkins, about which we are concerned, and not any reference such as you have made to compilations of official lists in the Federal Register back in 1935.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate.

MAY 26, 1937.

MR. HARRY HOPKINS,

Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPKINS: This will acknowledge your letter of May 24 relative to my request for data concerning the names, salaries, and positions of administrative personnel of W. P. A. The list of the names, addresses, and salaries of the State administrator, deputy administrator, State director of finance and statistics, State director of women's and professional projects, State director of division of operations, and district directors of W. P. A. districts in

Pennsylvania is only a small part of the data that should be made available upon request to representatives of the public.

In view of the tremendous importance of our Federal relief program I wish to review in some detail the correspondence which you and I have had on this subject.

On March 19, 1936, I wrote you as follows: "I have read your statement carried by the Associated Press in which you say: 'No employee of the Works Progress Administration, either administrative or engaged on a project, is required to make any contribution to any political party. No Works Progress Administration employee's job will be in jeopardy because of the failure of said employee to make such contribution. No employee of the Works Progress Administration shall at any time solicit contributions for any political party, and evidence of such solicitation will be cause for immediate discharge. The question of whether or not to contribute to any political party is a matter entirely for the voluntary decision of said employee. No person shall be employed or discharged by the Works Progress Administration on the ground of his support or nonsupport of any candidate of any political organization.'"

"I believe this to be a step in the right direction. However, it is only one of a number of decisive actions which, in my judgment, should be taken if relief is to be kept out of politics in the future. Unfortunately, conditions have been allowed to develop to such an extent and the difficulty of control of the national organization of the W. P. A. from Washington is so great that no mere statement of policy such as you have made, sincere and thoroughgoing as it doubtless is, can solve this problem.

"My approach to this question has been governed very largely by the definite statements made by those in authority that they desired relief kept out of politics. On April 28, 1935, President Roosevelt said: 'The most effective means of preventing such evils in this work-relief program will be the eternal vigilance of the American people themselves. I call upon my fellow citizens everywhere to cooperate with me in making this the most efficient and the cleanest example of public enterprise the world has ever seen. It is time to provide a smashing answer for those cynics who say that a democracy cannot be honest and efficient. If you will help, this can be done. I, therefore, hope you will watch the work in every corner of this Nation. Feel free to criticize. Tell me of instances where work can be done better or where improper practices prevail. Neither you nor I want criticism in a purely fault-finding or partisan spirit, but I am jealous of the right of every citizen to call to the attention of his or her Government examples of how the public money can be more effectively spent for the benefit of the American people.' This statement, coupled with your own, as quoted above, indicates a desire for honest, efficient administration which is to be admired."

However, statements of this sort are not sufficient to insure the desired results. Evidence of waste, partisan use of W. P. A. funds, and needless red tape is found on every hand. Without solicitation of any kind, letters have come to me from all over the country revealing a state of affairs which, in many instances, is positively vicious. I can cite example after example of wicked practice, such as is found in the case of a Republican W. P. A. supervisor, with a wife and seven children dependent upon him, replaced by a Democrat, with but two persons dependent upon him, for no reason other than partisan issues. These are not isolated cases. Situations of this kind prevail all over the country. You have doubtless read the account given by Mr. Johnson, formerly State supervisor of the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania, in the last issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Certainly conditions as reported by Mr. Johnson in the State of Pennsylvania cannot be corrected simply by dictating an office memo.

You will observe, therefore, Mr. Hopkins, that as early as March 1936 I had expressed a deep interest in the work-relief administration problem. However, in the heat of the campaign, September 30, you stated in the newspapers, "Senator Davis thinks of nothing except in terms of politics and never did in his life * * * The only time he shows any interest in the unemployed is near election." The facts do not bear out this statement. I wish to assure you that my continued interest in this problem is not political, and I would question the advisability of impugning the motives of men in public life who differ with you.

On May 7, 1937, work-relief problems had developed to such a state that Hugh S. Johnson in his column said: "Harry Hopkins is reported to have said that a cut of \$500,000,000 in relief appropriations will fire 400,000 relief workers. That figures out \$1,200 per worker on relief. * * * This would indicate that relief living is at least as fat as that of one-third of our employed population. * * * The error in this is that the whole \$1,200 does not go to the relief worker. Only about \$720, as an average, goes to him. Accurate figures are not available, but it is generous to say that only about 58 percent of the billions spent on relief trickles down to those on relief. * * * Mr. Hopkins says the total overhead is only 4.7 percent and adds that 10 percent is considered good administration in business management. It all depends on what you call overhead. Mr. Hopkins' boys roll their own as far as accounting is concerned. It would be interesting to see an independent audit of the seven billions or so dollars that they have broadcast. * * * It is one of the most grotesquely fantastical and tragic pieces of administration in the history of the human race."

This was the statement of General Johnson, a great friend of the President, who speaks out of the realistic experience he had

with the W. P. A. while in charge of it in New York City. Would you say that his statement was made for political purposes?

I note in the table of statistics you have sent me May 24, 1937, that of the total expenditures of W. P. A. in the State of Pennsylvania cumulative through March 31, 1937, you state that only 2.9 percent has been spent for administration. But, according to General Johnson, the average cost of administration has been 4.7 percent. How do you explain this discrepancy? Does it cost less to administer work relief in Pennsylvania than elsewhere? Will you kindly give me this information together with your explanation?

On January 19, 1937, I wrote you as follows:

"Your letter of January 18, the first I have had from you, in response to my letter of December 29, is at hand.

"In reply to my request that the public be informed as to the names, addresses, positions, and salaries of the administrative personnel of the W. P. A., you say: 'I cannot see how it could have a legitimate interest in the individual salaries and addresses of the many hundreds of employees performing minor clerical functions,' which, permit me to say, Mr. Hopkins, is quite beside the point. Your remark has led me to examine the file of letters I have written you during the last year. In each of these letters, if you will trouble yourself to examine them, it will be evident that at no time have I asked for a list of W. P. A. workers 'performing minor clerical functions.' Inasmuch as you have signed your name to the above statement, the public should now learn that you are dodging facts. This should interest the taxpayers, as they are now taking under consideration the possibility of the organization of a new department of the President's Cabinet to be known as the Department of Social Welfare, in connection with which your name is sometimes mentioned.

"I have insistently asked for the names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all administrative officials, which includes administrators, assistant administrators, State supervisors, project supervisors, investigators, foremen, managers, and the assistants of all of these. Perhaps I have failed to list them all, but this will do well enough for a beginning. These people may not be paid salaries of more than \$93.50 a month but they exert political influence, and that, Mr. Hopkins, is what we are talking about.

"I am not asking you for a list of actors, architects, draftsmen, artists, sculptors, teachers of art, librarians, musicians, teachers of music, playground workers, editors, bookkeepers, accountants, auditors, statistical editors, enumerators, stenographers, typists, blacksmiths, bricklayers, stonemasons, carpenters, cement finishers, electricians, painters, plasterers, etc.

"I am asking you, and let me repeat it, for the names, addresses, salaries, and positions of all the administrative personnel of the W. P. A. and F. E. R. A. and other relief organizations which you have had in charge during the last 4 years, to include the names of administrators, assistant administrators, foremen, managers, and the assistants of all these, together with all others whom the taxpayer will wish questioned when they are called to give an account of the money spent during the last 4 years at your direction."

This request still stands unanswered, and I maintain that this is information to which the taxpayers are entitled and that it should be made available, upon request, to representatives of the public.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

JULY 2, 1937.

MR. HARRY HOPKINS,

Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPKINS: I understand that at your request the Senate provision that the names, addresses, salaries, and positions of all administrative personnel in the W. P. A., F. E. R. A., and all relief organizations which you have headed up, receiving more than \$1,000 a year heretofore or at the present time was taken from the appropriation bill when it went to conference. I understand that you stated that if this provision were omitted you would see to it that I received this data for the State of Pennsylvania. I request that you make this data available as soon as possible. I should like to have it within the next 30 days if you can provide it within that time.

Most cordially yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

JULY 14, 1937.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: In accordance with your request of July 2, 1937, I am enclosing herewith a list showing the names, positions, salaries, and location of all administrative employees of the Works Progress Administration and the National Youth Administration in Pennsylvania receiving \$1,000 a year or more. There are no employees of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration now in Pennsylvania.

These lists were made up from pay rolls for the period June 16 through June 30.

Sincerely,

HARRY L. HOPKINS, Administrator.

MR. DAVIS. Mr. President, this correspondence shows that I spent nearly 18 months in correspondence with Mr. Hopkins before he would consent to release to me the names,

number, addresses, and salaries of the administrative employees of W. P. A. in Pennsylvania. Finally, after the election of 1936 had passed, and after 18 months of futile requests, I received a partial although imperfect response to my petition for this information. Much of this correspondence was carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the press. I was alone in asking for the information. Certainly Mr. Hopkins knew that I wanted the information. He knew why I wanted it because I had consistently charged that there was politics in W. P. A. in Pennsylvania, and yet he would not cooperate with me to stop it.

MR. WAGNER. Mr. President, Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, who has been nominated by the President to be Secretary of Commerce, comes from my State of New York. I will not intrude myself for too long a time into this discussion, when we should be coming to a vote, because those who have spoken for Mr. Hopkins have already stated his achievements and paid tribute to his high character.

Of course, as a matter of traditional policy in the Senate, the issue as to the confirmation of one nominated for a position in the Cabinet is much narrower than in the case of the ordinary nomination sent to the Senate. The Senate has always recognized that the President, as the Chief Executive of the country, is entitled to have in his own family those in whom he has confidence and whose advice he desires during his administration. Unless there has been something asserted and established affecting the moral character of the individual appointed, the Senate has readily confirmed, and rarely in all its history has there been a mere partisan issue raised in the case of a nomination of this character.

As I recall, there has been only one case since the Civil War in which the Senate has rejected a Cabinet nomination, and that was the case of Mr. Warren, during the Coolidge administration. It was established beyond question that Mr. Warren had been a lobbyist for the so-called Sugar Trust. The Senate felt that his appointment to the high office of Attorney General did not deserve confirmation.

I am not relying in my vote, however, merely upon that sound policy which has always been observed by the Senate. I am voting for the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins because I know that in so doing I represent the sentiment of my State, and also because of the high character of Mr. Hopkins, and because of his unusual success in one of the most difficult tasks that has ever devolved upon any individual.

During the debate no one has referred to the rise of Mr. Hopkins to his present place. He has held many positions of honor and of great responsibility. He has discharged the duties of all of them with extraordinary success, and always, of course, with unquestioned integrity.

In 1912, after his graduation from college, Mr. Hopkins became connected with the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, which is the largest nonsectarian private charity organization in the whole United States. In the course of that employment he conducted an investigation of slum conditions, and his report, though made way back in 1912, is still one which will enlighten many of us on the great problem of slum clearance in this country. Although he was quite a young man at the time, he was highly complimented for his work in that regard.

Mr. Hopkins' work attracted the attention of the then mayor of New York, Maj. John Purroy Mitchel, one of our eminent mayors, now deceased, and he persuaded Mr. Hopkins to become the executive secretary of the New York City Board of Public Welfare. I am somewhat more familiar with that work because, as a member of the State Senate in the State of New York at that time, I had occasion to be in touch with his work in that particular department. That duty he discharged with great distinction and with marked ability.

Mr. Hopkins applied for leave to go to the front during the World War, but he was rejected because of the condition of his eyesight. He insisted upon making some contribution, however, and was placed in charge of the work of the Gulf

division of the American Red Cross. He did his work there so well, Mr. President, that he attracted the attention of those interested in that particular enterprise and was later made the head of the entire southern division.

I need not tell the Senate the kind of work which is involved in the Red Cross, particularly during wartime. Mr. Hopkins handled large sums of money, and performed all the other services required, with great distinction and absolute integrity.

After the war, Mr. Hopkins was appointed a director of the New York Tuberculosis Association, and in that field of endeavor he also worked with great success, being responsible for building up that organization into a great force for research in preventive medicine.

In 1931, when New York State was confronted with the problem of feeding the unemployed and taking care of and sheltering the destitute, Mr. Hopkins was selected as working director of the temporary emergency relief administration of the State. In 1932 Mr. Hopkins became chairman of the temporary emergency relief administration by appointment of then Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During all this time, in his service in the State of New York, when under his direction there was distributed \$140,000,000 to alleviate the needs of the poor and the destitute and unemployed, there was never the breath of suspicion of misappropriation of any funds. On the contrary, the business people of New York, as well as those who were interested in this problem from the social standpoint, all praised him very highly.

If I may remind the Senate, during the last part of the Hoover administration, several Senators were exceedingly apprehensive of what was going on in the country. We saw countless people out in different sections of the country who lacked shelter, food, and clothing. The first major relief bill to take over and to expand upon the efforts of the R. F. C. was introduced by myself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the late Senator from Colorado, Mr. Costigan, whose recent death profoundly shocked us all. The Senator who is now gracing the chair will remember the occasion very well, because he participated in that movement also. Hearings were conducted, and the most tragic situations were disclosed. The city of Chicago, in particular, was so badly hit that neither the State nor the municipality could cope with it, and yet the Federal Government refused to move in the way of doing anything to alleviate the situation. The Senator from Illinois came before our committee and stated the plight of his particular State.

In 1933 the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], Senator Costigan, and myself constituted ourselves a committee to improvise legislation for the setting up of some independent Federal machinery for bringing relief to the States. We sent for Mr. Hopkins. Not one of us had ever met him before. We had only heard about his successful work in the State of New York. He sat down and aided us in the drafting of the legislation which Congress later enacted, and thereafter the President asked Mr. Hopkins to head that particular activity called the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Later he headed the C. W. A. and W. P. A. programs.

Without going over the entire record—because it has been so well done by others who preceded me—I will say that Mr. Hopkins undertook this tremendous task, and until the end of the last session I had heard no criticism of his work. Year after year, when the appropriations came up for consideration, Senators on the other side, as well as Senators on the Democratic side of the Chamber, rose and spoke approvingly of Mr. Hopkins, and there was no suggestion that political influence was in any way involved in the administration of his office.

I think I have a right to say that from the very beginning, by my votes as well as my public utterances, I have been insisting upon freeing relief administration from any kind of political influence. I knew Mr. Hopkins would not utilize

relief for political purposes, but no head of an undertaking of that kind, involving the expenditure of \$9,000,000,000, can be expected to go to every corner of the United States and watch every little subordinate to see whether he is attempting to persuade somebody employed under W. P. A. to vote one way or the other.

I voted for the proposed Hatch amendment. I voted against requiring the submission to the Senate of the names of the directors in each State, because, frankly, I feared that this would bring political considerations to bear.

If I may say so, Mr. President, I have consistently followed that course in my own State. I had nothing to do with the appointment of the administrators in my State. I did not know who they were to be until after their appointment. All have rendered admirable service. Colonel Somervell has been directing W. P. A. in New York City—the most difficult relief task in the country—to the complete satisfaction of all and entirely free from any suggestion of politics. I know that W. P. A. employment has there been based solely upon the need of the individual, and that has been true throughout my State.

Indeed, no suggestion was made by the Sheppard committee that there was any politics involved in the administration of W. P. A. in the State of New York. The number of heads of families employed at one time on W. P. A. work by reason of the unemployment situation has reached 300,000. In all this time, several million men being employed on W. P. A. off and on, only one complaint has been made which came to the Sheppard committee, was investigated by the Sheppard committee, was found to be absolutely unfounded, and was dismissed.

Mr. President, I went through a rather strenuous campaign. I had a very alert and able opponent against me. All but four newspapers in the State were against me. I do not complain about that. They felt that my opponent should be elected. But what I mean to say is that my opposition was very alert. So was my colleague's opposition. As a matter of fact his opponent was a gentleman of distinction in New York who had been one of the administrators of relief in the city of New York. And I may say, Senators, that during the entire campaign, and it was a vigorous campaign covering over 2 months, not a suggestion came from our opposition that the W. P. A. was used in the slightest way to influence a single vote. At the time we had about 250,000 men employed under W. P. A.

If I had been the administrator I would not have made the political speeches which Mr. Hopkins made. I would have refrained absolutely from any kind of political activity even as an individual. He frankly admits that if he had to do it over again he would not make such addresses. I do not suppose all of us would want to have search made into all our indiscretions.

Let us look at the accomplishments of Mr. Hopkins as the head of the W. P. A. The administrative expenses, about which we hear so much, are down to 2.3 percent. On the total outlay of administrative expenses, the percentage is only 3 percent, whereas Congress, in the legislation it enacted, authorized him to expend as high as 5 percent of the fund for administrative expenses.

What has the W. P. A. accomplished? It has built 12,000 new public buildings, and repaired, improved, or enlarged 36,000. It has constructed 46,000 miles of highways, roads, and streets and 157,000 miles of highways were improved or repaired. The W. P. A. built airports, laid sewers, developed vast park and play areas, and carried on conservation, public health education, and cultural projects. It has many more accomplishments to its credit. I shall not delay the Senate by reading them all. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks the record, which I have before me, of actual accomplishments of W. P. A. throughout the country, so far as complete data are available.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to may be printed in the Record.

The matter is as follows:

TABLE 7.—Physical accomplishments on Works Progress Administration projects

THROUGH OCT. 1, 1937
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES
[Preliminary—subject to revision]

Type	Unit of measurement	Number or amount		
		New construction	Additions	Improvements
Public buildings—total.....	Number.....	12,212	1,363	36,510
Educational buildings—total.....	Number.....	1,824	672	19,316
Schools.....	Number.....	1,771	647	18,802
Libraries.....	Number.....	53	25	514
Recreational buildings—total.....	Number.....	3,777	238	2,664
Auditoriums.....	Number.....	184	52	206
Stadia, grandstands, etc.....	Number.....	752	39	257
Gymnasiums.....	Number.....	376	86	238
Other (pavilions, bathhouses, etc.).....	Number.....	2,465	61	1,963
Institutional buildings—total.....	Number.....	284	61	2,484
Hospitals.....	Number.....	86	33	968
Penal institutions.....	Number.....	80	14	261
Other.....	Number.....	118	14	1,255
Courthouses, offices, and other administrative buildings.....	Number.....	615	116	2,545
Dormitories.....	Number.....	384	14	983
Fire houses.....	Number.....	129	17	1,156
Garages.....	Number.....	793	61	463
Aircraft hangars.....	Number.....	73	3	75
Warehouses.....	Number.....	630	34	812
Armories.....	Number.....	132	2	211
Other buildings and small structures (bus and streetcar shelters, etc.).....	Number.....	3,571	145	5,801
Demolition of buildings.....	Number.....			6,938

Type	Unit of measurement	Number or amount	
		New construction	Improvements
Highways, roads, streets, and related facilities:			
Highways, roads, and streets—total.....	Miles.....	46,650	158,694
Rural primary roads—total.....	Miles.....	7,873	17,952
Paved.....	Miles.....	2,353	2,162
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	5,520	15,790
Rural secondary roads—total.....	Miles.....	31,255	123,037
Paved.....	Miles.....	2,044	1,969
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	29,211	121,068
Urban—total.....	Miles.....	6,568	16,647
Paved.....	Miles.....	3,944	4,990
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	2,624	11,657
Other (parks, cemeteries, etc.)—total.....	Miles.....	954	1,053
Paved.....	Miles.....	253	213
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	701	845
Road shoulders (not included above).....	Miles.....	2,935	20,785
Bridges—total.....	(Number..... Length in feet.....)	19,229 636,422	18,035 692,734
Wood.....	(Number..... Length in feet.....)	13,778 424,770	11,396 322,802
Steel.....	(Number..... Length in feet.....)	1,418 84,928	4,998 208,579
Masonry.....	(Number..... Length in feet.....)	4,033 126,724	1,641 61,353
Culverts.....	(Number..... Length in feet.....)	200,719 5,365,685	42,681 1,059,940
Grade-crossing elimination.....	Number of crossing eliminations.....	24	
Sidewalks and paths—total.....	Miles.....	5,156	3,208
Paved.....	Miles.....	4,033	2,280
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	1,123	928
Curbs.....	Miles.....	4,480	1,077
Gutters.....	Miles.....	1,592	325
Guardrails and guardwalls.....	Miles.....	637	369

TABLE 7.—Physical accomplishments on Works Progress Administration projects—Continued

Type	Unit of measurement	Number or amount	
		New construction	Improvements
Highways, roads, streets, and related facilities—Con.			
Curbs—Continued.....			
Lights for roads and streets.....	Number.....	8,433	34,832
Roadside drainage.....	(Miles of road equipped..... Linear feet of ditch..... Linear feet of pipe.....)	203 70,804,426 4,629,895	1,223 180,866,215 1,184,219
Roadside landscaping.....	Miles.....		14,690
Street signs.....	(Linear feet of line painted..... Number of signs made..... Number of signs erected.....)	12,723,969 825,078 363,848	
Removal of car and railroad track.....	Miles of single-line track.....		452
Airports and airway equipment (excluding buildings):			
Landing fields.....	(Number..... Acres..... Length in feet.....)	130 13,574 1,099,510	136 19,756 382,731
Runways.....	Number.....	36	2
Air beacons.....	Number.....	8,357	
Air markers.....	Number.....		
Recreational facilities (excluding buildings):			
Athletic fields.....	(Number..... Acres..... Length in feet.....)	1,534 8,297 11	1,360 10,296
Additions to athletic fields.....	Number.....	69	
Parks.....	(Number..... Acres..... Length in feet.....)	881 26,707 92	3,210 191,433
Additions to parks.....	Number.....	1,107	
Fairgrounds.....	(Number..... Acres..... Length in feet.....)	20 1,059 1,303	104 4,902 3,792
Playgrounds—total.....	Number.....		
School.....	Number.....	751	3,087
Other.....	Number.....	552	705
Swimming pools.....	(Number..... Surface area in square feet.....)	433 6,950,463	143 2,757,462
Wading pools.....	(Number..... Surface area in square feet.....)	324 977,827	47 152,100
Golf courses.....	(Number..... Number of holes..... Acres.....)	123 1,384 8,637	186 2,436 17,463
Tennis courts.....	Number.....	3,535	1,174
Handball courts.....	Number.....	569	50
Horseshoe courts.....	Number.....	716	56
Ice-skating rinks.....	(Number..... Surface area in square feet.....)	731 34,011,344	159 10,373,290
Ski jumps.....	Number.....	29	4
Ski trails.....	Miles.....	28	31
Outdoor theaters.....	Number.....	48	10
Band shells.....	Number.....	88	25
Water supply, sanitation, and drainage systems:			
Water mains, aqueducts, and distribution lines.....	(Miles..... Number of consumer connections.....)	4,295 123,028	1,459 165,103
Storage tanks, reservoirs, and cisterns.....	(Number..... Gallons capacity.....)	1,272 559,016,724	329 4,069,469,438
Storage dams.....	Number.....	3,504	298
Wells.....	Number.....	1,632	1,437
Treatment plants (excl. cess-pools and septic tanks):			
Sewage.....	Number.....	243	151
Water.....	Number.....	60	63
Garbage incinerators.....	Number.....	25	24
Pumping stations.....	(Number..... Miles.....)	252 6,300	103 1,963
Storm and sanitary sewers.....	(Number of service connections..... Miles.....)	156,323 152,681	88,912 27,349
Manholes and catch basins.....	Number.....	865,955	12,776
Sanitary toilets.....	Number.....	37,938	21
Cesspools.....	Number.....	3,883	57
Septic tanks.....	Number.....	7,777	
Mine sealing.....	(Number of mines..... Number of openings..... Linear feet of ditch.....)	67,327 30,476,208 1,097,001	
Mosquito control.....	(Acres drained..... Gallons of spray used..... Linear feet of ditch..... Linear feet of pipe..... Acres drained.....)	1,218,757 6,144,148 3,698,679 2,043,552	534,365 34,377,346 504,789 6,471,548
Flood and erosion control—navigation aids—irrigation:			
Docks, wharves, and piers.....	(Number..... Feet of usable water front..... Area in square feet..... Number..... Length in feet..... Cubic yards placed..... Linear feet..... Miles..... Miles.....)	99 40,243 1,491,776 1,161 92,638 193,657 266,935 53 166	139 122,924 7,011,447 49 6,020 73,397 106,966 166 940
Jetties and breakwaters.....			3,240
Bulkheads.....			
Canals and channels.....			
River bank improvements.....			
Stream bed improvements.....			

TABLE 7.—Physical accomplishments on Works Progress Administration projects—Continued

Type	Unit of measurement	Number or amount	
		New construction	Improvements
Flood and erosion control—navigation aids, etc.—Con. Dredging (other than channels).	Cubic yards of material dredged.	9,901,740	
Dams (other than storage or power).	Number.	17,083	154
Riprap (other than river bank).	Square yards surfaced.	4,103,678	494,954
Retaining walls and revetments.	(Number.	10,601	2,738
Levees and embankments.	Linear feet.	2,231,556	334,731
	Linear feet.	932,813	1,980,022
Irrigation.	Cubic yards placed.	9,990,075	7,724,338
	(Acres.	120,572	1,767,714
	Miles of flume or canal.	266	2,553
Electric and communication utilities:			
Powerhouses.	(Number.	21	44
Transmission lines (electric).	Kilowatt capacity.	17,171	153,497
	Miles.	110	51
	Miles.	277	142
Power distribution lines.	Number of consumer connections.	6,562	2,061
Telephone and telegraph lines.	Miles.	905	672
Police and fire-alarm signals.	(Number of boxes and signals.	38,003	
	Linear feet of line strung.	4,089,676	
Grounds improvements:			
Landscaping around public buildings.	(Number of buildings.		9,025
	(Acres.		22,434
Miscellaneous landscaping.	Acres.		3,962
Lighting airports, parking lots, athletic fields, etc.	(Number of places lighted.	276	24
	(Acres lighted.	6,103	2,436
Fountains and ornamental pools.	Number.	187	20
Fencing.	Miles.	5,426	6,804
Cemetery improvements.	Acres.		3,427
Miscellaneous:			
Car and railroad track.	Miles of single line track.	15	230
Boats and ships.	Number.	362	690
Fire observation towers.	Number.	32	6
Paving (other than roads, walks, or runways).	Square yards hard surface.	3,230,943	761,897
Tunnels:	Square yards other surface.	3,758,054	1,615,822
	Number.	9	4
Vehicular.	(Length in feet.	1,001	971
	Number.	49	11
Pedestrian.	(Length in feet.	10,750	2,053
	Number.	135	24
Other.	(Length in feet.	84,580	10,227
	Number.	139	61
Fish hatcheries.	Annual fingerling capacity.	336,195,700	241,947,018
Monuments and historic markers.	Number.	394	93
Gas lines (distribution and transmission).	(Linear feet.	410,256	211,409
	Number of consumer connections.	1,402	5,359
Oil and other pipe lines.	Linear feet.	43,485	10,188

TABLE 8.—Physical accomplishments on projects
THROUGH OCT. 1, 1937

NONCONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

[Preliminary—subject to revision]

Type	Unit of measurement	Number or amount
Conservation (not elsewhere classified):		
Reforestation.	(Acres.	32,854
	Number of trees planted.	13,453,639
Firebreaks.	Miles.	1,227
Fire and forest trails.	Miles.	2,125
Plant and tree nurseries.	Number of nurseries.	625
	Number of plants or trees planted.	12,559,623
Tree surgery.	Number of trees trimmed.	1,263,984
	Number of trees removed.	257,004
Bird and game sanctuaries.	Number of sanctuaries established.	819
Noxious plant eradication.	Acres.	6,370,862
Spray treatments, disease, and insect-pest eradication (except mosquito control).	(Acres sprayed.	548,164
	Gallons of spray used.	11,755,718
Rodent destruction.	Tons of poisoned food used.	12,284
	Number.	24,688,109
Planting oysters.	(Acres of bed prepared.	59,013
	Bushels planted.	2,633,143
Food and fuel distributed:		
Milk.	Number of quarts.	82,397,320
Foodstuffs (not elsewhere classified).	Number of pounds.	711,310,838
Wood.	Number of cords.	571,413

TABLE 8.—Physical accomplishments on projects—Continued

Type	Unit of measurement	Number or amount
Work in libraries:		
New branch libraries.	Number established.	3,535
New traveling libraries.	Number established.	1,164
Reading rooms in existing libraries.	Number established.	4,502
Cataloging for existing libraries.	Number of volumes cataloged.	20,015,595
Renovation of books—total.	Number.	33,649,219
Public school volumes.	Number.	11,857,464
Public library volumes.	Number.	15,824,692
Other volumes.	Number.	5,967,063
Sewing rooms:		
Articles made—total.	Number.	121,710,287
Garments—total.	Number.	95,028,273
Men's.	Number.	17,107,605
Women's.	Number.	24,555,147
Boys'.	Number.	15,972,052
Girls'.	Number.	21,518,995
Infants'.	Number.	15,874,474
Other articles.	Number.	26,682,014
Canning and preserving.	Net pounds.	36,303,817
School lunches served.	Number.	129,015,093
Medical, dental, and nursing assistance:		
Dental clinics conducted.	Number of clinics.	283
	Number of persons examined.	209,825
	Number of persons treated.	59,893
Medical clinics conducted.	Number of clinics.	96
	Number of persons examined.	186,255
	Number of persons treated.	132,375
Medical and dental clinics assisted.	Number of clinics.	1,581
	Number of persons examined.	1,545,512
	Number of persons treated.	768,349
Medical examinations other than at clinics.	Number of adults examined.	275,760
	Number of children examined.	1,056,202
Nursing visits.	Number of group inspections made.	213,450
	Number of persons inspected.	2,023,136
Nursing aid to clinics.	Number of home visits made.	2,450,133
Nursing aid at immunizations.	Number of W. P. A. nurses assisting.	3,053
	Number of immunizations.	638,972
Art:		
Art classes.	Average monthly attendance.	55,231
Civic art centers.	Aggregate attendance.	2,525,432
Drawings, easel paintings, murals, and sculptured works.	Number.	51,475
Etchings, lithographs, wood blocks, etc.	(Number of originals.	3,003
	Number of prints.	24,216
Posters.	(Number of originals.	25,484
	Number of reproductions.	469,204
Arts and crafts.	Number of objects.	39,692
Index of American Design plates.	Number of plates made.	7,011
Stage sets, dioramas, and models for visual education.	Number.	822
Music:		
Music classes.	Average monthly attendance.	140,321
Musical performances.	(Average number per month.	4,549
	Average monthly attendance.	3,107,345
Theater:		
Theatrical productions.	Number.	1,501
Theatrical performances.	(Average number per month.	2,833
	Average monthly attendance.	1,043,478
Writing.	Number of books and pamphlets written.	116
	Number of copies distributed.	401,928
Historical surveys:		
Historical American Building Survey.	(Number of structures measured.	2,302
	Number of drawings made.	16,244
	Number of photographs made.	17,480
Historical American Merchant Marine Survey.	Number of vessels surveyed.	270
	Number of drawings made.	677
	Number of photographs made.	545
	Number of counties whose records have been listed.	2,021
	Number of county inventories published.	50
Historical Records Survey.	Number of towns whose records have been listed.	1,040
	Number of churches whose records have been listed.	40,453
	Number of agencies whose records were surveyed.	28,792
Federal Archives Survey.	Linear feet of files surveyed.	4,876,461
Planning surveys conducted.	Number.	539
Research and statistical studies conducted.	Number.	1,027
Engineering surveys.	Square miles of mapping survey.	211,746
	Miles of line survey.	72,088
	Number of permanent markers set.	91,430
Maps.	Number of maps drawn.	89,681
Indexing and cataloging.	Number of items indexed or cataloged.	293,761,171
Braille.	Number of blind persons employed.	274

TABLE 8.—Physical accomplishments on projects—Continued

Type	Unit of measurement	Number or amount
Braille.....	Number of Braille pages transcribed.....	1,245,674
	Number of Braille maps made.....	41,542
Housekeeping aids.....	Number of visits made.....	4,020,548
Assistants in nursery schools.....	Number of families aided.....	663,513
	Number provided.....	957
Museum activities.....	Number of articles constructed or renovated.....	3,312,786
	Number of articles cataloged.....	5,228,029
Education (month of October 1937)—total.....	Number of classes.....	100,145
	Number of enrollees.....	1,144,689
Literacy.....	Number of classes.....	17,195
	Number of enrollees.....	192,481
Vocational.....	Number of classes.....	10,596
	Number of enrollees.....	159,430
Avocational and leisure time.....	Number of classes.....	10,978
	Number of enrollees.....	138,226
Parent and homemaking.....	Number of classes.....	10,019
	Number of enrollees.....	136,379
College level and correspondence.....	Number of classes.....	1,899
	Number of enrollees.....	29,609
Public affairs.....	Number of classes.....	1,555
	Number of enrollees.....	27,249
Workers'.....	Number of classes.....	1,630
	Number of enrollees.....	21,723
General adult.....	Number of classes.....	20,259
	Number of enrollees.....	271,308
Nursery schools.....	Number of classes.....	1,451
	Number of enrollees.....	40,243
Other.....	Number of classes.....	24,563
	Number of enrollees.....	120,038
Recreation:		
Community centers operated.....	Number.....	14,785
Community centers assisted.....	Number.....	7,815
Public participation in recreational activities (week ending Aug. 28, 1937):		
Physical recreation.....	Number of participant hours.....	11,428,857
Social recreation.....	Number of participant hours.....	2,471,797
Cultural recreation.....	Number of participant hours.....	2,285,304
Therapeutic recreation.....	Number of participant hours.....	134,253
Miscellaneous:		
Archaeological excavations.....	Number of articles found.....	419,657
	Number of gardens.....	30,661
Gardening.....	Acres.....	7,972
Shoe repair.....	Number of pairs.....	609,446
Furniture repair.....	Number of articles.....	879,288

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the business people of my State are in favor of this nomination. There has been some suggestion from the other side that business has no confidence in Mr. Hopkins, because he has never had any business experience. As a matter of fact, he has been the administrator of a governmental activity which has had the largest pay roll of any separate entity in the United States. The business people of my State, speaking through Mr. Harriman, have declared emphatically that they have confidence in Mr. Hopkins, and expect that he will make a very efficient Secretary of Commerce. Indeed he has a great opportunity.

Mr. President, in our drive for recovery, we must bring about cooperation among industry, labor, and the Government. I think Mr. Hopkins understands the problems of industry. He understands the problems of the worker. He has had long experience as a Government official, and knows to what extent the Government ought to guide both business and labor in our cooperative activities. For that reason I welcome his appointment as Secretary of Commerce, and I hope that upon confirmation, he will devote himself unsparingly to fostering that cooperation upon which our national well-being so vitally depends.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I approach this argument in a little different fashion from that in which my predecessors, in speaking upon it, have approached it.

We have before us two records—the record of the Sheppard committee, and the record before the Commerce committee—when considering the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins.

It does no good, Mr. President, for men from the recesses of their brains to tell us of the record of Mr. Hopkins in other respects, or for Senators from other States, where there was no question about what transpired, to go into

their archives and tell us that there was nothing at all disgraceful, nothing at all reprehensible, in those States.

Before coming to an argument in reference to the particular matters which involve Mr. Hopkins—I do not say they involve his integrity or his honesty, but they involve him politically, in dealing politically with those who had no option, and those who had no power to resist—I desire to settle one question, once and for all, in this body.

It has been argued here by many that the selection of members of the Cabinet is a personal matter of the President, and that we ought not to interfere with any selection that he may make. Upon us devolves the responsibility of approving that selection, and upon us rests the obligation of doing our duty in reference to any particular nomination which may be sent in by the President upon that score.

This is not the first time the same question has been before the Senate. In 1925 an epochal contest was here, a contest involving the appointment of an Attorney General. Upon that contest the lines were very nearly equal; and many Senators argued then, just as it is argued now, that the matter was one for the President to determine, and that when he had determined it, it was not for us to have aught to say, or in any degree to interfere.

I dissent from that view. I dissented from it 13 years ago, when the nomination of Charles Beecher Warren was before this body for confirmation. I dissent from it now, and I will dissent from it every time a man is named to a Cabinet office by the President of the United States.

At that time it was argued elaborately by various persons that we ought not to touch the question; that, having been named by the President, he was sacrosanct; and that we ought not, even though the obligation is constitutionally placed upon us, to touch the question at all. At that time an argument was made by a very distinguished brother of ours, in whom I have the utmost confidence. This is what he said:

Mr. President, can it be argued that we ought to close our eyes, seal our lips, fold our hands, and let this nomination go through without a protest, simply because the nomination is made by the President and that we ought to acquiesce; that it is part of his official family? There is no such thing in law as a President's official family. There is no such thing in law as a Cabinet officer. The Attorney General has under his control enforcement officers in every locality under our flag. It is his duty, as a sort of general controlling an army of prosecutors and marshals and investigators and detectives all over the land, to enforce every Federal law that is on the statute books. His power, his influence for the upholding of law, for the stability of our institutions, goes into every State, into every hamlet, into every Federal court, and even before every Federal commissioner; so that the importance of the office cannot be exaggerated.

We set at rest then by our vote the question whether or not we should act upon a nominee of the President for a Cabinet office. We set it at rest then in a singular fashion, by a vote which was a tie, and in which it was endeavored to bring the then Vice President into the Chamber so that the tie might be unraveled. He could not then be found. However, the situation was such that we settled the question then forever, so far as this argument is concerned. Let me read the vote quickly. I read the names of those who voted "nay" upon that nomination. I am reading, of course, only those who are now here:

Senators ASHURST, BORAH, FRAZIER, GEORGE, HARRISON, JOHNSON, KING, McKELLAR, NEELY, NORRIS, PITTMAN, SHEPPARD, SHIPSTEAD, WALSH, and WHEELER.

All of them voted that the nomination should not be confirmed, and it was not confirmed.

There is another thing in respect to which I dissent from my fellows, and that is concerning the position Mr. Hopkins occupies and concerning the idea that he should be free from any interference by the Senate of the United States in pursuance of its duty. Mr. Hopkins says that he was one of a "team" and that as a member of that "team" he did unhesitatingly and unquestioning everything that might be ordered of him. I dissent from that view, and most emphatically so, for I cannot imagine the kind of individual that will say that he is a member of a "team" and if he is asked to do something at variance with his judgment and his conscience

he will do it notwithstanding his conscience and his judgment. In effect this makes the nominee both conscienceless and without judgment. I have a higher idea of the duty of the individual Senators than that.

I know men who have refused Cabinet appointments because they would not stand in that relation to the appointing power. But Mr. Hopkins says he as a member of that "team" and under any circumstances would be loyal to what the President requested of him. I cannot believe that he means this because he cannot mean that he would do anything, no matter what, in his loyalty.

The other day I read an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of January 20 upon that very question. I wish to read to the Senate the editorial. I read it so that it may, if possible, have its influence upon the 3 or 4, 5 or 6, 7 or 8, 9 or 10, 11 or 12 Senators who are going to vote against the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins' nomination. I am not reading it in the expectation that it is going to prevent the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins' nomination because I am sufficient of a realist to understand that I am standing here upon my feet exerting myself in a cause which is already defeated, but I do not care a continental damn whether or not that is so, for I know my cause to be right, and, knowing it to be right, I will fight for it here if mine shall be the only adverse vote upon this floor. The editorial in the Baltimore Sun of January 20 reads:

FOR THE RECORD

In his speech discussing the qualifications of Mr. Harry L. Hopkins for the Cabinet post for which Mr. Roosevelt has nominated him, Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, made a point which deserves more than passing notice. The Senator had been criticizing Mr. Hopkins' notorious participation, as W. P. A. Administrator, in the various partisan undertakings of the President. He then made this comment:

"Mr. Hopkins stated that his course had largely been dictated by a sense of loyalty to the President and that he considered himself 'a member of the team,' having a part to play. No one can complain of his loyalty, but one having the distribution of large sums of public money for the relief of dependent people ought to have considered the impropriety of attempting to influence people touching a question of national policy far removed from the domain of relief."

That is what I speak of—the impropriety of the actions of Mr. Hopkins. Senators who are defending this gentleman who was nominated for the office of Secretary of Commerce may talk until doomsday, and may say that he did this, that, and the other thing in their States, and that he has been found by the people of the United States to be a very good Administrator, and so on; but no living soul, I maintain, can say with absolute accuracy that there was no impropriety in the actions of Mr. Hopkins in dealing with the W. P. A. He does not say so; but Senators who are advocating the confirmation of his nomination say so for him. He does not say so. He says that if he were to travel the road again he would not do the things that he did. He says that if he had it to do over again he would "fire" the men, for instance, in Pennsylvania who were guilty of the wrongs there. He says these things. Senators who are advocating the confirmation of his nomination say, on the contrary, he has done none of them. He admits them, and he says, in so many, many words, that if he had the road again to travel, if again it were put up to him whether he would permit the things that were done, he would not tolerate them, nor make the political speeches he made. He would see that they were stopped.

I read further from the editorial in the Baltimore Sun:

Loyalty, as everyone knows, is one of the major human virtues. But there are loyalties and loyalties. A man appointed to be judge clearly owes no loyalty to the Governor or President who appointed him. He owes loyalty only to the law which he is sworn to interpret and enforce. A private secretary, at the other extreme, owes a special kind of loyalty to his employer—a greater loyalty, perhaps, than a Cabinet member owes to his chief.

Mr. Hopkins' conception of his obligation to Mr. Roosevelt would have been praiseworthy had he been a mere private secretary. It might have been admissible had he been a Cabinet officer. But his position as relief administrator transcended these. He was entrusted with the spending of billions of dollars in public funds, taken from the people of the country as a whole.

Senators on the other side seem to think the public funds that were used by this man were taken from their particular

class and their particular party. Not so; the funds were taken from all the people of this land, and should be administered in behalf of all the people of the land.

He dealt, in a very unusual relationship, with millions of unfortunates. His attitude, his policy, stood between them and destitution.

Who could argue that, under such circumstances, Mr. Hopkins was merely a member of Mr. Roosevelt's "team"? Who could argue that if Mr. Roosevelt hinted at it, it was Mr. Hopkins' right and his duty to use his special power to influence public opinion with relation to a moot question, such as that of packing the Supreme Court? Who could argue that loyalty demanded that he inject himself into primary elections in order to influence the outcome?

To ask these questions is to answer them. When Mr. Hopkins announced that he regarded himself, when W. P. A. Administrator, as a member of the President's team, he announced at the same time that he had no fit conception of the job which was entrusted to him. For that job is one in which the loyalty demanded is not to an individual, even if that individual be the President of the United States. The loyalty demanded of an administrator of public relief is loyalty to an abstract principle, call it even-handed justice, call it impartiality, call it humanity, or what you will.

That expresses better than I could my idea of the loyalty owed by Mr. Hopkins to his appointing power, and I will not admit that a single bit of other loyalty rested upon his shoulders than is described in that editorial.

Now, let us consider the evidence for a moment. As we go through the evidence we find permeating Kentucky and Pennsylvania one thing, namely, the use of the power of the Administrator of the W. P. A. He denies it, it is true; but in the next breath he admits that he did wrong, and he would not do it again if he had it to do over. Just follow, sir, for a moment this testimony:

Page 89:

Senator JOHNSON of California. Those things which they have held to be reprehensible in the W. P. A., you do not controvert or contradict?

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, insofar as we are now discussing the individual cases that the Sheppard committee investigated, I am not raising any questions about the accuracy of those reports.

The Members of the Senate know what the reports are. The reports show conclusively that he was mixing, either himself or through his subordinates, in Pennsylvania and in Kentucky, and he was influencing thus the people who came under him. I read further from the testimony:

Senator JOHNSON of California (referring to Pennsylvania). Anybody could have had that information.

Mr. HOPKINS. Not necessarily, Senator. I have known wrongdoing to have gone on for a year before anybody found out about it.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Absolutely. But you do not want to say that that is the excuse for these things in Pennsylvania, do you?

Mr. HOPKINS. No, Senator; not at all.

Senator JOHNSON of California. I thought you were.

Mr. HOPKINS. No, Senator; I am not. I certainly do not like so many of the things that have gone on in Pennsylvania.

Yet Senators stand here and split hairs as to what Hopkins did. The whole testimony reeks with just that sort of denial, and it is only that sort of denial that arises in relation to what occurred.

I quote another excerpt from the testimony:

Page 83:

Mr. HOPKINS. I stopped it hundreds of times.

Senator JOHNSON of California. But you did not stop it in Pennsylvania or Kentucky?

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, Senator, despite the people I fired throughout the country, I did not stop it. It had happened before I found it out, and then I took the action that I thought was necessary. I do not know whether anybody could stop all these things from happening in the first instance. Because, after all, American politics has a long history and tradition, and most of you know the way the local political organization works in America, and it does not consider some of the things necessarily bad, that you or I might consider bad—such as selling tickets. I mean to say that that has been done in many places.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Do not lay the emphasis so much on tickets, though.

Mr. HOPKINS. Or getting money or making contributions or telling somebody that, "You have to give 2 percent of your salary."

Senator JOHNSON of California. Or hitting a lot of truckmen for \$100 apiece?

Mr. HOPKINS. That is right. I think it is reprehensible, and there is not one redeeming feature in it.

And there was not. Talk as you will about New York State. New York State is free from wrong, so our friends

from New York say. They may be right. So other States are free from wrong; but the States that were mentioned were not free from wrong, and that statement rests upon the admission of Hopkins.

I wish I had the power adequately to paint the sewing circle there in Pennsylvania. "With fingers weary and worn, with eyelids heavy and red," there sat those old women in Pennsylvania, sewing, sewing, sewing; and then they were dragooned into taking three, four, or five hundred tickets. The tickets were thrown at them. "Take these tickets! Take these tickets, you, and buy them!" And they reached into their frayed and worn purses, and they dug out a dollar, a dollar and a half, two dollars apiece, and paid for some five-hundred-and-odd tickets that were thus sent to them—they, the worst people on the face of the earth from whom to demand such an outlay! It was shameful; it was disgraceful; and no amount of saying now that "I am sorry I did it, and I would not do it again if I had it to do over again"—not a whole roomful of that sort of thing mouthed by everybody here who is for Harry Hopkins and for that sort of thing can cram it down the throats of three or four or five or six of us, and convince us that that is the right or decent thing to do, and his toleration of it cannot be defended.

Thus it goes all along the line. "I am thinking now just of human beings." How I have heard that expression echoed down the corridors of this Chamber! "I am thinking just of human beings, men, women, and children. I am thinking just of these human beings who, through no fault of their own, have had the misfortune to be put upon a W. P. A. roll. I am thinking of them." You may talk to me forever without making any future impression about being for men, women, and children, and the submerged one-third that are "ill-clad, ill-housed, and hungry"; but, Senators, when you came to deal with them in the most precious possession they had, the right to vote, you said to them, "Take these tickets, \$1.50, \$2, if you will, and do as you are told to do on election day."

I tell you, Mr. President, it makes one's blood run cold. Oh, it does not make the blood run cold of some of you over there. It would not touch you if I were to call the roll of those who died because of it. But if the things are true that Hopkins admits to be true—and he does admit it—then it is time for us to put our stamp of disapproval upon it. You cannot condone it and you cannot approve it. You cannot condone it and you cannot approve it, no matter how much eloquence may be wasted in this body, no matter how many people may tell you that those things are things which always were done in politics. It may be that they were. I have not met with that kind of politics. If it were done in my State in my behalf, I would repudiate it so quickly that I would make the man who did it suffer for it; and I will not act in a different way in regard to this great man Hopkins, around whose head we put a halo here today, and around whom we have drawn the mystic circle, and one of us has said in substance he is a greater man than the Saviour Himself. Just think of it. This man has proven himself in this way upon the record that is before the Senate of dealing with these people in the manner I have described.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may be permitted to inform the Senator from California that he has 5 minutes more under the limitation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well, sir. I am sorry I have but 5 minutes. I wish I had the time that I ought to have occupied at the last session upon this nomination. I do not like to talk long. I do not like to get up here and make a speech of this sort, or a speech of any sort, now. I make it because it is my duty to make it. I make it because it is the way I have thought all my life. I make it because when Republicans were in power I fought nominees of the President of the United States whom I thought to be unfit. I make it because I want to stop this thing with the W. P. A. and with the poor people of the country. I repeat, in the language of the great man I have quoted before, I speak, I think, of human beings alone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks an article by Raymond Clapper relative to Mr. Hopkins.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 16, 1939]

HOPKINS VERSUS HOPKINS

(By Raymond Clapper)

Frequently during this administration men connected with it have retired from their New Deal positions only to reappear in the public eye as energetic floggers of the regime with which they had been connected. They find that policies which once seemed pure as the driven snow are, when seen from outside the administration, somewhat smeared with soot. There is no critic more severe and exacting than the New Deal officeholder who has put away his halo and gone back to the world of sin. His is sharper than a Hoover's tooth.

In a sense, Harry Hopkins has outdone them all. Whereas officeholders have stepped out and immediately cocked their blunderbusses at others in the New Deal, Hopkins, not a man to do things by halves, has taken to shooting at himself. Former Relief Administrator Hopkins has become a most penetrating and constructive critic of Relief Administrator Hopkins.

Former Relief Administrator Hopkins disapproves of the political speeches made by Relief Administrator Hopkins last summer. Former Relief Administrator Hopkins thinks that Relief Administrator Hopkins was wrong last summer in not firing Kentucky relief employees who were playing politics. Former Relief Administrator Hopkins thinks the Senate made a mistake last summer when it voted down the Hatch amendment to prohibit political use of relief, whereas Relief Administrator Hopkins, who was expressing his views on various political matters at the time, remained silent when a word from him would have forced the Senate to adopt the Hatch proposal.

No one predicted that this boon would result from taking Hopkins out of W. P. A. Looking at relief from the outside, he is now its most constructive critic, and he is giving the force of his endorsement, which is considerable because of his experience and ability, to efforts in Congress to fumigate relief of its political odors. As an ex post facto administrator of relief, Hopkins is setting a standard that his successors can well strive to reach.

Hopkins has thus helped to prepare a receptive atmosphere for the recommendations of the Byrnes committee, which proposes pulling relief and reemployment activities together into a new Department of Public Welfare, placing them on a permanent basis as far out of reach of partisan politics as is possible with this sort of activity. Relief activities would be coordinated and tied in with public works, unemployment compensation, and larger assistance to the aged and incapacitated. The Byrnes committee also will seek to include in the pending temporary relief appropriation bill safeguards against political manipulation of relief.

The House bill omitted any provision for introducing civil service into the relief organization. If a new permanent relief set-up is to be ordered by Congress, the present omission of civil-service provisions in the temporary relief appropriation is of small importance.

Roosevelt had, by Executive order, prepared to blanket into civil-service status, existing employees of W. P. A. on February 1. The House objected to freezing political appointees into W. P. A. by this method and vetoed the whole scheme but neglected to provide any substitute in the form of civil-service examinations. Some 35,000 jobs are involved. Those jobs ought to be placed on a nonpolitical career basis.

Also, State relief administrators now have to be confirmed by the Senate, which makes senatorial patronage out of those jobs and makes them as political as the old postmasterships. Senators insisted upon the right of confirmation, fearing that otherwise the relief administrators might become hostile political forces. Those administrators, too, ought to be nonpolitical career men.

Anyway, former Relief Administrator Hopkins shows by what a simple process objective and constructive criticism can be obtained. Take a New Dealer off his job and start him talking. It would be really getting somewhere if Roosevelt, after leaving the White House, became a newspaper columnist and started telling what he thought was wrong with the New Deal. That would be something.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to detain the Senate longer in the consideration of this nomination, but I shall occupy the time of the Senate for a few moments, not only because I deem it my duty to do so but because I want to do so.

I hope that in what I shall say I may be free from emotion, and free from any unfairness toward anybody; but we are dealing here, and must continue to deal longer than most of us would desire, with a subject that is intensely human. That subject is the relationship of government to those of its citizens who are unfortunate enough not to be able, by their own efforts or their own opportunities, to enjoy the share of whatever economic prosperity or wealth there is in the Nation, which under other circumstances they would be permitted to enjoy.

We have been engaging here during the past 6 or 7 years in what has come to be popularly known as relief. We started out in the beginning under the delusion that the Federal Government could loan money to the States, and thereby escape its responsibility of administration; and for a while we harbored the delusion that that money loaned to the States would be returned. We soon discovered the fiction of that delusion; and the Government, by gradual steps with which we are all familiar, took over the responsibility of relief and work on a national scale. Mr. Hopkins became the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, referred to as the F. E. R. A. Gradually that developed into the C. W. A., the Civil Works Administration, which finally evolved into the W. P. A., the Works Progress Administration.

During the entire time during which Mr. Hopkins has been the Administrator of F. E. R. A., and C. W. A., and W. P. A., there have been expended \$9,357,076,000. During that time between 225,000 and 250,000 separate projects have been prosecuted and completed under the W. P. A. and the C. W. A. under the administration of Mr. Hopkins. During the life of the Works Progress Administration 6,780,000 different persons have worked throughout the United States on projects that were conducted under the supervision of the W. P. A. and Mr. Hopkins.

I ask any Senator here who opposes this nomination, or who opposes the program of the W. P. A., to point to a single one of these 250,000 projects in connection with which there has been discovered a dollar's worth of graft under the administration of Harry Hopkins. These projects have consisted of the erection of schoolhouses all over this Nation. They have consisted of the construction of playgrounds and parks and highways. They have consisted of the rejuvenation and revival of historic sites of one kind and another all over the Nation in order to perpetuate in the minds of coming generations the deeds of heroism of those who have gone before. They have consisted of all kinds of worthy projects.

I have seen some of these projects. Driving through the mountains of Kentucky I have stopped in the middle of the road to observe a three-room or four-room modern brick and stone schoolhouse standing hard by a one-room log cabin, the sort of schoolhouse in which our people in those sections have been educated from generation to generation. I have seen hundreds of more commodious buildings all over the country.

In all the debate over the character of Harry Hopkins as a person and over the character of his administration as a public officer I have heard no reference made to these evidences of permanent improvement, to the enrichment of our social and economic lives in not only every county but in almost every village and hamlet and throughout every countryside over this Nation, in connection with no one of which has anybody charged, nor can anyone prove, that a dollar of graft went to anyone in charge of these projects or this program, or to anyone who worked upon them.

Since the 4th of March 1933, 6,780,000 men have been employed under the jurisdiction of Mr. Hopkins, and the newspapers of the Nation which have been unfriendly to this administration, and which have sought to find something which could be the basis of a charge of misconduct, have gone out with spyglasses and with magnifying instruments of all kinds to find a peg on which to hang a hat indicating corruption or incompetence. Then, in an unfortunate statement made by Mr. Hopkins in the spring of 1933, he said that if he were still a citizen of Iowa—having once been a citizen of that State—he would vote for the opponent of our friend and colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I said at the time Mr. Hopkins made that statement, and I now say, that it was an indiscreet statement, that it was a mistake for him to have made it, it was an improper statement for him to have made. Aside from the merits of any contest in which the Senator from Iowa, for whom all of us have the highest respect and esteem, was a candidate, the statement was an indiscretion, it was improper, whether it was deliberate or casual, as at the time I thought it to have been. The Senator from Iowa, however, believed it was deliberate. Whether it

was deliberate or casual, it ought not to have been made. I venture the suggestion that if it had not been made the Sheppard committee never would have been authorized by an amendment to go into the activities of the W. P. A. The Sheppard committee having already been appointed to investigate campaign expenditures in the various senatorial races, the statement that was made by Mr. Hopkins created such a furor on the floor of the Senate that it resulted in the amendment of the resolution under which the Sheppard committee was appointed, involving an investigation of the activities of the W. P. A. in senatorial contests.

As the result of the activities of the Sheppard committee, a report has been brought here in which the committee criticizes the activities of certain subordinate officers of the W. P. A. in three States—Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. In its report the Sheppard committee was just enough and fair enough to say that although they discovered some activities in Kentucky that were reprehensible, I had no knowledge of them, and was in no way responsible for them. The Sheppard committee could have made no other sort of report, because if they had had all of their investigators in Kentucky, and if they had remained there until now, and should stay there another year, they could not have produced and could not now produce any evidence that could have fastened upon me either knowledge of or responsibility for the things which they criticized in the State of Kentucky.

Reference has been made in the report of the committee and in the debate on the floor of the Senate to the report made by a very lovable and estimable newspaper reporter who represented the Scripps-Howard press of an investigation he made in the State of Kentucky. I refer to Mr. Thomas L. Stokes. I know Mr. Stokes. We all know him. He is an estimable man, and I think wanted to be fair. I do not think the fact that that particular chain of newspapers was hoping for my defeat and in their paper in the State of Kentucky opposed me vigorously day by day in their news columns and their editorials had any effect on the kind of report Mr. Stokes made to his paper.

At that time there were 60,000 people on the rolls of the W. P. A. in Kentucky, and after spending weeks in the State, Mr. Stokes found that 22 people had been guilty of conduct which he thought was subject to criticism, and he wrote about them in his papers. Those cases were immediately referred to Mr. Hopkins, and he did what every department of this Government will do under such circumstances; he sent his investigators to the particular localities involved to interview the people concerned and to investigate the charges which had been made in these newspaper articles. The same course had been pursued by the Post Office Department and is pursued day by day and year by year whenever charges are made against a postal employee. The same practice is followed by every other department when charges are made against its personnel. It sends its investigating force to look into the charges and make a report.

By inference and by implication Mr. Hopkins is criticized here because he pursued that policy, because he sent his own investigators instead of going into some other department and getting theirs to investigate these cases. The result of his investigation was that, out of 22, 2 of the charges were sustained, and 20 of them were declared not sustained. I do not know what evidence the committee has in addition to that which was gathered by Mr. Hopkins' investigators. It is not very important. The committee says that Mr. Hopkins was wrong, that 18 of the charges were sustained instead of 2.

Not only these newspapers, which were, I suppose, interested in the result in Kentucky, not on account of my importance, but because in the position I occupy temporarily I was a sort of symbol in the State of Kentucky of the New Deal fight, but other newspaper writers here in Washington have undertaken to create the impression that if it had not been for corruption and intimidation and coercion and reprehensible conduct of someone in connection with W. P. A.,

I would have not been returned to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, so far as the people of Kentucky are concerned, I do not have to defend my record on the floor of the Senate. The first office I ever held was that of prosecuting attorney, to which I was elected when I was 26 years of age. At the end of 4 years in that office I was elected a judge without opposition.

Before my 4-year term had expired I had been elected to Congress to represent a great district of that State in the House of Representatives. And although I had a fight in my first campaign, for 14 years I was returned without opposition to the House of Representatives.

In 1926 I was nominated, without opposition, for United States Senator from the State of Kentucky. At the end of a 6-year term I was renominated, carrying 112 counties out of 120, and was reelected in 1932.

In 1938 I was confronted with the opposition of the chief executive of my State, a popular and colorful young man who had been able to build up a political organization which was the strongest and the most nearly invulnerable that ever existed in the State of Kentucky. In my campaign for renomination I had to fight that organization, with all those on the State pay roll who were openly assessed from 2 to 5 percent of their salaries in order to raise a campaign fund, and the Sheppard committee reports that the portion of that fund collected from men and women who were employed and paid wholly or in part out of the Federal Treasury, amounted to \$70,000. That included men who were working on the highways, where the Federal Government was helping to pay the expense. That included old-age pension agents in every county, who drew half their salary out of the Federal Treasury. That included the personnel of the unemployment service, every dollar of whose salary was paid out of Washington, not a dollar of which was contributed by the State of Kentucky.

I do not wish to rehash the primary campaign in Kentucky; but in view of the unfair and in some cases deliberate misrepresentations of those who have tried to paint my nomination and election with the infamy of imputed wrong, I have a right to speak. As I said here the other day when interrupting another Senator, for 30 years I have been holding public office because I have been chosen by the people of my State and my communities. I never bought a vote nor authorized a man or woman to buy a vote in my behalf. I never put up a dollar in all my life to buy a vote. I do not believe in it. All my life I have stood for fair and honorable elections in Kentucky and offended and made enemies of some of my own party associates when I fought for a direct primary in order that the people might vote their choice, instead of having their choices manipulated in political conventions. And whatever the outside world thinks, knowing, as I think I do, what the people of Kentucky think, regardless of what the people anywhere else may think, I do not

propose either for unfriendly newspapers or for unfriendly colleagues of my own here, if there are any, to smear that record that I have made over a period of 30 years in order to find a pretense for voting against Harry Hopkins for Secretary of Commerce.

About all the compensation we get here in this body is perhaps the delusion that we are rendering a public service and the reputation that we are able to build up in the performance of that service. There are no financial rewards that we can honorably take here that could not be infinitely multiplied on the outside by the exercise of only half of our energy or our care or our diligence in the performance of some private duty.

Mr. President, what are the facts? The statement has been made here in this debate that because the pay rolls of the W. P. A. were increased in 1938 we are automatically to conclude that the increase was due to politics. Who made that increase possible? Not Harry Hopkins. Not Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is the ultimate target of all this denunciation—and you need not doubt that for a moment. Harry Hopkins did not make possible the increase in the W. P. A. pay roll in 1938. Franklin D. Roosevelt did not make it possible. The Congress of the United States bears the responsibility for that, for they increased the amount that might be expended for W. P. A. labor over that of 1937 because, whatever you call it, whether it was a recession or whether it was a depression, as described by those whose minds dwell in venom—whether it was a depression or a recession—it began in the latter part of 1937; and the number of those unemployed began to increase in the latter part of 1937, and that condition continued over into 1938. As a result of the increased unemployment of this Nation the House of Representatives and the Senate increased the amount of money appropriated for public works in the Nation, and if Mr. Hopkins had not expended that money by the employment of more men and women he would have been subject to and would have received the just condemnation of the Congress of the United States and the country.

So it is not true that because of the increase in the W. P. A. rolls in 1938, politics is to be inferred. But if politics is to be inferred, then I say that in every State in the Union the increase of employees was determined by the need for work on the W. P. A. and in connection with other programs of the States of this Nation by reason of unemployment.

I have before me, Mr. President, tabulated figures for both 1937 and 1938 concerning the number of those on the W. P. A. rolls in every State in the Union, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record here as part of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Kentucky. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The figures are as follows:

Employment on Works Progress Administration operated projects for the year 1937

Region and State	By States and by months for week ending—											
	Jan. 30	Feb. 27	Mar. 27	Apr. 24	May 29	June 26	July 31	Aug. 28	Sept. 25	Oct. 30	Nov. 20	Dec. 25
Region I:												
Connecticut.....	18,847	18,376	18,300	17,775	17,746	17,364	15,549	13,343	13,387	13,894	14,371	16,890
Maine.....	7,290	7,572	7,543	6,307	5,376	3,048	2,283	2,187	2,429	2,617	3,483	4,441
Massachusetts.....	92,459	91,389	90,779	89,557	88,849	79,583	59,779	60,748	61,322	61,332	62,727	70,728
New Hampshire.....	7,736	7,875	7,386	7,092	6,610	5,926	5,283	4,509	4,477	4,767	5,133	5,707
New York City.....	187,666	183,326	180,296	175,944	179,644	177,204	144,382	138,007	140,870	139,852	135,705	137,724
New York (exclusive of New York City).....	74,999	78,409	80,591	79,012	72,071	66,939	60,131	57,053	54,179	52,117	53,002	52,446
Rhode Island.....	10,088	10,619	11,377	11,112	11,932	11,414	9,283	8,969	8,887	9,160	9,796	13,150
Vermont.....	3,769	4,003	3,976	3,980	3,384	2,907	2,182	1,889	1,919	2,140	2,467	3,401
Total.....	402,854	401,629	400,248	390,779	385,612	364,385	298,872	286,705	287,470	285,879	286,684	304,487
Region II:												
Delaware.....	2,119	2,142	2,101	2,033	2,026	1,931	1,826	1,666	1,664	1,686	1,796	1,985
District of Columbia.....	6,754	6,517	6,601	6,691	6,720	6,523	5,904	5,590	5,477	5,625	5,764	5,956
Maryland.....	12,815	13,730	12,740	12,190	11,727	10,760	9,361	9,054	8,517	8,874	8,801	9,883
New Jersey.....	74,038	73,976	74,537	74,629	73,481	67,396	61,374	55,734	56,600	58,299	56,946	57,948
Pennsylvania.....	223,458	219,072	215,288	203,953	195,122	179,738	157,184	152,582	148,297	157,414	157,971	158,982
West Virginia.....	39,205	37,498	37,381	36,531	36,001	32,059	28,769	27,450	26,958	27,045	27,902	28,806
Total.....	358,389	352,935	348,648	336,027	325,077	298,407	264,408	252,086	247,513	258,943	259,180	263,560

Employment on Works Progress Administration operated projects for the year 1937—Continued

Region and State	By States and by months for week ending—											
	Jan. 30	Feb. 27	Mar. 27	Apr. 24	May 29	June 26	July 31	Aug. 28	Sept. 25	Oct. 30	Nov. 20	Dec. 25
Region III:												
Alabama	28,035	27,699	27,070	25,927	27,394	20,668	21,357	18,498	18,280	20,681	22,075	24,896
Arkansas	24,817	32,260	25,989	26,684	27,070	23,653	19,911	19,942	17,987	18,758	19,418	21,057
Florida	22,424	23,641	24,086	23,816	25,548	25,356	23,852	23,486	22,956	22,917	23,194	24,140
Georgia	32,845	32,334	29,458	29,496	28,774	23,761	22,778	22,207	20,676	21,421	21,904	23,755
Louisiana	32,631	36,098	30,758	32,374	30,779	26,145	22,889	21,919	22,182	21,699	22,578	24,369
Mississippi	23,732	22,132	21,900	23,021	22,429	17,892	16,902	15,935	15,905	16,954	18,040	20,191
North Carolina	27,346	26,751	25,127	24,826	24,495	22,670	19,673	19,135	18,829	18,842	20,045	22,366
South Carolina	23,898	22,650	22,331	21,924	20,914	19,572	17,303	16,637	15,190	15,366	17,359	19,080
Tennessee	30,589	30,058	28,375	26,636	25,989	23,342	20,767	19,183	18,644	18,709	20,453	21,327
Texas	74,918	76,018	77,711	79,242	77,618	68,213	59,296	52,100	43,184	41,726	44,860	55,200
Virginia	22,829	23,344	23,036	22,666	19,913	19,284	17,546	16,557	16,377	16,418	16,987	18,204
Total	344,064	352,985	335,931	336,612	330,923	290,556	262,274	245,596	230,210	233,491	246,913	276,576
Region IV:												
Illinois	153,558	150,266	148,075	150,017	146,456	132,188	112,231	107,810	104,470	103,612	106,926	108,413
Indiana	62,268	64,303	65,773	63,081	58,486	54,143	45,227	42,261	40,968	41,756	42,686	45,441
Iowa	24,494	25,498	24,344	22,902	21,161	19,642	17,244	16,083	16,323	16,541	16,957	18,425
Kansas	39,636	37,925	36,355	37,699	35,552	30,704	25,464	24,169	24,650	25,438	25,864	26,953
Kentucky	47,139	49,662	47,482	47,766	47,301	41,321	37,590	36,518	35,285	36,570	37,458	39,652
Michigan	65,894	65,550	61,798	58,546	54,212	50,514	44,915	43,763	42,472	42,294	42,824	46,756
Minnesota	44,477	46,774	46,802	43,154	39,775	37,999	35,167	31,417	31,295	33,043	35,482	36,717
Missouri	81,328	83,510	79,503	77,972	72,095	64,656	56,814	49,886	48,953	48,616	48,453	51,539
Nebraska	21,758	24,003	22,321	21,639	21,619	19,058	16,907	16,685	16,431	17,544	18,855	19,916
North Dakota	17,316	17,552	16,444	15,154	12,124	11,943	10,109	8,292	9,113	10,480	11,719	12,865
Ohio	131,225	128,101	124,177	119,734	115,989	99,000	88,032	83,860	84,207	85,088	87,827	91,694
South Dakota	19,049	19,327	19,487	16,999	14,210	13,764	9,476	9,016	11,297	12,935	14,799	16,054
Wisconsin	48,781	51,542	50,793	47,025	43,949	42,063	36,455	34,917	33,215	34,366	34,826	38,855
Total	756,923	764,013	743,354	721,688	682,929	616,959	535,131	504,677	498,679	508,283	524,676	553,280
Region V:												
Arizona	7,514	7,925	8,255	8,721	8,485	7,682	6,590	6,387	6,391	6,483	6,519	7,038
California	105,264	103,976	105,235	106,504	108,417	98,605	80,476	73,185	68,709	66,237	68,531	73,346
Colorado	23,339	24,603	25,550	24,730	20,701	19,837	18,379	15,499	15,257	15,593	17,037	19,052
Idaho	7,252	7,858	7,761	7,156	5,425	4,700	4,293	4,024	4,146	4,286	5,509	7,628
Montana	12,004	11,889	11,548	12,069	10,274	9,387	8,070	9,310	10,813	11,953	12,339	13,542
Nevada	2,128	2,467	2,082	1,964	1,993	1,441	1,237	1,051	1,083	1,355	1,488	1,786
New Mexico	7,799	8,245	8,834	8,319	8,506	8,244	6,789	6,455	6,405	6,113	5,938	6,391
Oregon	15,446	15,994	15,846	14,413	14,370	13,206	12,400	9,824	9,067	9,099	10,868	12,136
Utah	8,211	8,119	8,654	8,106	7,622	7,511	6,608	6,257	6,434	6,164	6,400	7,388
Washington	33,120	30,082	31,189	32,390	29,183	25,508	21,420	20,085	19,560	21,351	24,457	31,741
Wyoming	2,924	2,942	2,931	2,772	2,413	2,365	2,026	1,736	1,731	1,694	1,935	2,621
Total	225,001	224,100	227,885	227,144	217,389	198,486	168,288	153,813	149,551	150,958	161,021	182,669
Oklahoma	46,680	45,798	54,777	54,416	53,538	48,651	41,766	37,575	37,194	37,197	38,704	46,171
United States total	2,133,911	2,141,460	2,110,843	2,066,666	1,995,468	1,817,480	1,570,739	1,480,452	1,450,617	1,474,751	1,517,178	1,626,743
Alaska						13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Hawaii	4,148	4,102	3,957	3,744	3,801	3,658	2,172	2,242	2,244	2,527	2,549	2,518
Grand total	2,138,059	2,145,562	2,114,800	2,070,410	1,999,269	1,821,151	1,572,924	1,482,707	1,452,874	1,477,291	1,519,740	1,629,261

Employment on Works Progress Administration operated projects for the year 1938

Region and State	By States and by months for week ending—											
	Jan. 29	Feb. 26	Mar. 26	Apr. 30	May 28	June 25	July 30	Aug. 27	Sept. 24	Oct. 29	Nov. 26	Dec. 24
Region I:												
Connecticut	20,247	20,879	21,310	22,268	23,551	25,497	27,623	28,723	29,701	31,581	32,341	28,448
Maine	7,670	7,943	7,314	7,897	8,008	8,338	8,827	9,304	8,575	10,131	10,806	10,226
Massachusetts	80,930	84,960	97,708	107,047	105,433	110,167	119,823	125,345	125,533	130,829	129,305	126,057
New Hampshire	7,323	7,309	8,285	8,449	8,366	8,761	8,928	9,475	9,547	13,607	13,418	10,928
New York City	138,750	143,797	151,788	159,217	164,727	170,082	173,300	172,245	179,595	183,656	184,085	178,412
New York (excluding New York City)	52,307	52,819	52,659	54,672	56,588	58,553	63,363	64,424	64,648	65,412	66,229	64,010
Rhode Island	13,072	12,570	12,723	13,728	14,283	15,080	16,073	16,490	16,966	18,084	17,658	16,385
Vermont	4,003	4,941	5,101	5,090	4,983	5,030	5,496	5,832	5,964	9,992	9,242	7,992
Total	324,902	335,218	356,888	378,368	385,939	401,508	423,433	431,838	440,529	463,292	463,084	442,458
Region II:												
Delaware	2,457	2,578	2,996	3,282	3,312	3,634	3,783	3,748	3,519	4,038	4,023	3,788
District of Columbia	6,854	7,042	7,960	7,998	8,215	8,626	12,311	12,242	12,589	13,072	12,698	12,453
Maryland	11,085	11,442	12,021	12,286	12,629	13,064	14,972	14,786	15,650	16,423	15,619	15,323
New Jersey	70,946	71,973	78,935	91,161	90,499	91,563	99,325	102,023	105,177	107,261	108,112	101,002
Pennsylvania	183,962	193,247	217,156	227,635	244,836	253,684	273,897	267,989	272,565	287,635	286,602	259,097
West Virginia	33,825	35,314	40,547	42,932	43,134	47,786	50,906	51,667	52,752	53,044	53,117	49,953
Total	309,129	321,506	359,615	385,294	402,625	418,357	455,194	452,455	462,252	481,473	480,171	441,616
Region III:												
Alabama	29,317	30,857	36,185	40,159	43,169	45,697	46,896	55,620	60,564	63,465	64,305	61,089
Arkansas	27,162	30,576	33,351	35,787	36,042	37,595	40,303	47,722	47,756	54,695	54,702	48,951
Florida	28,038	28,372	31,241	33,006	35,303	36,369	39,218	50,326	52,105	55,016	53,287	51,192
Georgia	32,518	33,912	38,833	42,963	45,359	48,022	51,431	55,822	58,147	71,093	70,788	59,540
Louisiana	27,986	30,320	31,120	31,607	31,682	33,391	38,517	44,023	48,274	52,330	54,649	52,138
Mississippi	23,802	26,131	29,719	31,616	33,425	35,704	36,637	42,573	39,032	54,112	49,279	47,380
North Carolina	26,101	28,804	31,145	33,768	35,330	37,371	42,058	45,945	48,260	52,077	55,143	54,918
South Carolina	27,176	27,173	30,115	32,429	34,044	34,941	37,593	41,714	46,114	56,844	50,718	41,069
Tennessee	26,155	28,413	30,990	32,139	32,735	35,366	39,679	45,189	46,242	48,767	55,558	54,768
Texas	64,923	70,963	76,330	80,937	81,087	81,494	86,103	90,828	91,679	106,753	112,067	107,288
Virginia	20,137	21,590	22,716	23,101	23,389	24,080	25,154	26,359	27,237	27,794	28,744	28,253
Total	333,322	357,111	391,745	417,512	431,565	450,030	483,589	546,121	566,310	642,949	649,240	606,649

Employment on Works Progress Administration operated projects for the year 1938—Continued

Region and State	By States and by months for week ending—											
	Jan. 29	Feb. 26	Mar. 26	Apr. 30	May 28	June 25	July 30	Aug. 27	Sept. 24	Oct. 29	Nov. 26	Dec. 24
Region IV:												
Illinois.....	132,424	149,276	194,687	206,355	217,367	223,980	241,270	246,678	252,381	257,108	252,373	242,458
Indiana.....	56,488	64,991	84,468	93,087	92,869	94,308	99,572	99,781	98,209	101,374	98,575	88,202
Iowa.....	21,288	26,376	30,594	33,490	33,522	33,907	33,753	33,804	33,858	33,816	33,206	31,181
Kansas.....	30,261	34,109	35,612	36,232	35,918	34,518	35,062	36,391	37,334	38,037	38,144	35,837
Kentucky.....	41,612	43,800	48,285	55,986	60,389	63,588	69,558	71,646	70,736	70,999	69,431	65,927
Michigan.....	64,749	89,356	120,156	146,704	175,790	185,109	192,749	203,446	191,115	165,264	154,108	145,380
Minnesota.....	42,938	48,561	57,696	60,776	62,104	61,861	64,912	65,582	67,653	68,552	68,844	66,176
Missouri.....	60,888	65,123	85,215	92,350	97,159	101,996	112,834	112,508	110,543	116,384	111,022	108,264
Nebraska.....	23,247	27,227	28,202	28,951	29,055	28,825	28,426	29,535	30,276	29,812	30,050	27,351
North Dakota.....	14,167	14,786	14,870	13,439	13,124	13,294	13,783	12,933	14,391	16,885	16,223	14,618
Ohio.....	114,705	150,030	196,168	230,637	238,609	249,318	267,224	269,348	282,523	285,442	274,712	262,715
South Dakota.....	16,457	17,474	17,402	15,279	15,374	15,759	10,689	12,518	15,118	17,073	17,524	15,483
Wisconsin.....	44,238	52,352	64,390	71,206	71,755	72,849	78,399	80,482	83,283	85,921	85,297	78,460
Total.....	663,662	780,461	977,745	1,084,492	1,143,035	1,179,312	1,248,329	1,274,652	1,287,420	1,286,667	1,249,509	1,182,052
Region V:												
Arizona.....	7,911	7,642	8,554	9,493	9,661	10,084	11,295	11,778	12,282	12,112	10,862	10,339
California, total.....	79,980	86,526	91,649	94,688	94,999	94,683	107,693	110,053	112,235	119,064	121,910	111,900
Northern.....	40,515	46,948	50,317	49,877	50,478	50,626	57,242	59,839	60,821	64,089	66,302	61,866
Southern.....	39,465	39,578	41,332	44,811	44,521	44,057	50,451	50,214	51,414	54,975	55,608	50,034
Colorado.....	23,484	25,517	27,171	28,359	28,083	28,340	31,786	32,189	32,313	31,271	31,596	28,532
Idaho.....	10,488	10,840	11,426	10,991	9,600	8,651	9,026	9,295	9,624	9,550	11,218	10,631
Montana.....	16,265	16,414	18,144	19,489	19,572	21,317	22,207	22,342	22,497	21,668	21,014	19,005
Nevada.....	2,268	2,240	2,657	2,378	2,195	2,191	2,262	2,402	2,465	2,557	2,512	2,536
New Mexico.....	7,231	8,001	9,858	10,022	10,043	10,686	12,754	13,905	13,493	13,398	12,704	11,226
Oregon.....	15,176	16,157	16,355	16,913	16,764	16,072	16,472	16,943	16,847	18,268	18,393	18,358
Utah.....	8,407	9,084	10,386	10,736	10,347	10,241	12,473	12,966	12,904	12,887	12,976	12,789
Washington.....	39,153	38,963	45,556	45,362	44,401	44,632	51,546	51,054	50,953	51,458	53,474	47,937
Wyoming.....	3,482	3,823	4,592	4,586	4,270	4,273	4,267	4,275	4,314	4,368	4,096	4,100
Total.....	213,845	225,207	246,358	253,017	249,935	251,170	281,781	287,202	289,927	296,601	300,755	277,353
Oklahoma.....	53,291	54,128	59,996	62,651	65,603	65,191	71,183	71,491	70,376	71,074	69,520	67,904
United States, total.....	1,898,151	2,073,721	2,392,347	2,581,334	2,678,702	2,765,568	2,963,411	3,063,759	3,116,814	3,242,056	3,212,279	3,018,029
Hawaii.....	2,463	2,498	2,509	2,030	1,686	1,557	3,421	3,195	3,108	3,218	3,285	3,148
Grand total.....	1,900,614	2,076,219	2,394,856	2,583,364	2,680,388	2,767,125	2,966,832	3,066,954	3,119,922	3,245,274	3,215,564	3,021,177

Mr. BARKLEY. I will go over the figures for all the States. The Sheppard committee singled out Tennessee, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania, three States, in which the W. P. A. was subject to criticism. I have made a tabulation of the percentage of increase in all the States and by regions, as decided by the W. P. A.

In the State of Connecticut the increase was 40 percent. In the State of Maine the increase was 33 percent. In Massachusetts it was 58 percent; in New Hampshire, 50 percent. In New York City it was 30 percent. In New York State, outside the city, it was 25 percent. In Rhode Island it was 20 percent. In Vermont it was 70 percent. In the whole region in which these States are located, region No. 1, the increase was 33 percent.

Region No. 2: In Delaware the increase was 55 percent. In the District of Columbia, where nobody was running for office, and where no politics possibly could have entered into it, the increase was 80 percent. In Maryland it was 38 percent. In New Jersey it was 42 percent. In Pennsylvania it was 40 percent. In West Virginia it was 50 percent. In that entire region, region No. 2, the increase was about 38 percent.

The third region: Alabama had an increase of 105 percent. Arkansas had an increase of 80 percent; Florida, 75 percent; Georgia, 84 percent; Louisiana, 85 percent; Mississippi, 100 percent; North Carolina, 110 percent; South Carolina, 60 percent; Tennessee, 110 percent; Texas, 65 percent; Virginia, 40 percent. The total increase in 1938 in the region known as the third region, in which these States are located, was an average of 80 percent.

The fourth region: Illinois had an increase of 80 percent. Indiana had an increase of 55 percent. Iowa had 45 percent. Kansas had about 20-percent increase. Kentucky had 55 percent. In the State of Michigan, from January to December, there was an increase of 115 percent. If there was a State in the Union in which the administration was interested in the election of a Governor at least—there being no senatorial race and Governor Murphy being a candidate for reelection—it was the State of Michigan. I believe it would

not be drawing on my imagination to say that the President and Mr. Hopkins, if they had any choice in Michigan, were in favor of Gov. Frank Murphy.

I know that all of us Democrats hoped for his reelection as Governor. And yet from August 1938 to November 1938, more than 50,000 people were taken off the rolls of the W. P. A. in the State of Michigan.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot yield. I am sorry. I have only 30 minutes, and I have not much time left.

In Minnesota the increase was 55 percent; in Missouri the increase was 75 percent; in Ohio it was 130 percent; in Wisconsin it was 75 percent; in Arizona it was 33 1/3 percent; in California, 40 percent; in Colorado, 19 percent; and so forth.

I ask unanimous consent to include this tabulation in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate having heard the request, and there being no objection, it may be printed. The tabulation is as follows:

REGION 1			
Connecticut:			
January.....		\$20,247	
December.....		28,488	
		8,241=	3%
Maine:			
January.....		7,670	
December.....		10,226	
		2,556=	33%
Michigan:			
January.....		7,314	
November.....		10,806	
		3,492=	50%

REGION 1—continued			
Massachusetts:			
January	\$80,930		
December	126,057		
	45,127	=	58%
March	97,708		
November	130,829		
	33,121	=	33%
New Hampshire:			
January	7,323		
December	10,928		
	3,605	=	50%
March	8,285		
November	13,607		
	5,322	=	62%
New York City:			
January	133,750		
December	178,412		
	39,662	=	30%
March	151,784		
November	184,085		
	32,301	=	20%
New York State:			
January	52,000		
December	64,000		
	12,000	=	25%
March	52,000		
November	66,000		
	14,000	=	25%
Rhode Island:			
January	13,072		
December	16,385		
	3,313	=	20%
March	12,723		
November	17,658		
	4,935	=	40%
Vermont:			
January	4,603		
December	7,992		
	3,389	=	70%
March	5,101		
November	9,992		
	4,891	=	95%
Total, region 1:			
January	324,902		
December	442,458		
	117,556	=	33%
REGION 2			
Delaware:			
January	2,457		
December	3,788		
	1,331	=	55%
March	2,996		
November	4,023		
	1,027	=	33%
District of Columbia:			
January	6,854		
December	12,453		
	5,699	=	80%
March	7,960		
October	13,072		
	5,112	=	65%

REGION 2—continued			
Maryland:			
January	\$11,085		
December	15,323		
	4,238	=	38%
March	12,021		
October	16,423		
	4,402	=	35%
New Jersey:			
January	70,946		
December	101,002		
	30,056	=	42%
March	78,835		
October	107,261		
	28,426	=	36%
Pennsylvania:			
January	183,962		
December	259,097		
	75,135	=	40%
March	217,156		
October	287,635		
	70,479	=	35%
West Virginia:			
January	33,325		
December	49,953		
	16,128	=	50%
March	35,344		
October	53,044		
	17,700	=	50%
Total, region 2:			
January	309,129		
December	441,615		
	132,486	=	42%
March	359,615		
October	481,473		
	121,858	=	38%
REGION 3			
Alabama:			
January	29,317		
December	61,089		
	31,772	=	105%
March	36,185		
October	63,468		
	27,283	=	75%
Arkansas:			
January	27,162		
December	48,951		
	21,789	=	80%
March	33,351		
October	54,695		
	21,344	=	65%
Florida:			
January	28,372		
December	51,192		
	22,820	=	75%
March	31,242		
October	55,016		
	23,774	=	70%
Georgia:			
January	32,518		
December	59,540		
	27,022	=	84%

REGION 3—continued			
Georgia—Continued.			
March	\$38,833		
October	71,093		
	32,260=	82%	
Louisiana:			
January	27,986		
December	52,198		
	24,212=	85%	
March	31,120		
October	52,330		
	21,210=	66%	
Mississippi:			
January	23,809		
December	47,380		
	23,571=	100%	
March	29,719		
October	54,112		
	24,323=	80%	
North Carolina:			
January	26,101		
December	54,918		
	28,817=	110%	
March	31,145		
October	52,077		
	20,932=	67%	
South Carolina:			
January	26,155		
December	41,069		
	14,914=	6%	
March	30,115		
October	56,844		
	26,729=	85%	
Tennessee:			
January	26,155		
December	54,768		
	28,613=	110%	
March	30,990		
October	48,767		
	17,777=	60%	
Texas:			
January	64,928		
December	107,288		
	42,360=	65%	
March	76,330		
October	106,750		
	36,420=	45%	
Virginia:			
January	20,137		
December	28,253		
	8,116=	40%	
March	22,716		
October	27,794		
	5,078=	25%	
Total, region 3:			
January	333,322		
December	606,646		
	273,324=	80%	
March	391,745		
October	642,949		
	251,204=	62%	

REGION 4			
Illinois:			
January	\$132,424		
December	242,458		
	110,034=	80%	
March	194,687		
October	257,108		
	162,421=	80%	
Indiana:			
January	56,488		
December	88,202		
	31,714=	55%	
March	84,468		
October	101,374		
	16,906=	20%	
Iowa:			
January	21,288		
December	31,181		
	9,893=	45%	
March	30,594		
October	38,037		
	7,443=	40%	
Kansas:			
January	30,461		
December	35,837		
	5,376=	18%	
March	35,612		
October	38,037		
	2,425=	10%	
Kentucky:			
January	41,612		
December	65,927		
	24,315=	55%	
March	48,285		
July	69,558		
October	70,999		
	21,273=	45%	
	22,714=	46%	
Michigan:			
January	64,749		
December	145,380		
	80,631=	115%	
March	120,156		
November	154,108		
	33,952=	35%	
August	203,446		
November	154,108		
	50,662=	Decrease 25%	
Minnesota:			
January	42,938		
December	66,176		
	23,238=	55%	
March	57,696		
November	68,844		
	11,148=	20%	
Missouri:			
January	60,888		
December	108,264		
	47,376=	75%	
March	85,215		
November	116,384		
	31,169=	38%	

REGION 4—continued			
Nebraska:			
January	\$23,247		
December	27,351		
	4,104=	2%	
March	28,202		
November	30,050		
	1,848=	5%	
North Dakota:			
January	14,167		
December	14,618		
	451=	5%	
Ohio:			
January	114,305		
December	262,315		
	148,010=	130%	
March	196,168		
November	274,712		
	78,544=	40%	
South Dakota:			
January	16,457		
December	15,483		
	1,174=	loss	
Wisconsin:			
January	44,238		
December	78,460		
	34,222=	75%	
March	64,390		
November	85,296		
	20,906=	32%	
Total, region 4:			
January	663,662		
December	1,182,052		
	518,390=	85%	
REGION 5			
Arizona:			
January	7,911		
December	10,339		
	2,428=	33 1/3%	
March	8,554		
October	12,112		
	3,558=	40%	
California:			
January	79,980		
December	111,900		
	31,920=	40%	
March	91,649		
October	119,064		
	27,415=	30%	
Colorado:			
January	23,484		
December	28,532		
	5,048=	19%	
March	27,171		
October	31,271		
	4,100=	20%	
Idaho:			
January	10,488		
December	10,631		
	143		
March	11,426		
October	9,550		
	1,876	Decrease	

REGION 5—continued			
Montana:			
January	\$16,265		
December	19,005		
	3,740=	20%	
March	18,144		
October	21,668		
	3,524=	18%	
Nevada:			
January	2,268		
December	2,536		
	268		
New Mexico:			
January	7,231		
December	11,226		
	3,995=	30%	
March	9,858		
October	13,398		
	3,540=	3%	
Oregon:			
January	15,176		
December	18,358		
	3,182=	2%	
March	16,365		
October	18,393		
	2,028=	12%	
Utah:			
January	8,407		
December	12,789		
	4,382=	50%	
March	10,386		
October	12,887		
	2,501=	20%	
Washington:			
January	39,143		
December	47,937		
	8,794=	20%	
March	45,556		
October	51,458		
	5,902=	15%	
Wyoming:			
January	3,482		
December	4,100		
	618=	8%	
March	4,592		
October	4,368		
	224	Decrease	
Total, region 5:			
January	213,845		
December	277,353		
	63,508=	30%	

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have given these figures—and they are official figures—in order to refute the suggestion that in any State, or in the Nation as a whole, Harry Hopkins, Franklin D. Roosevelt, or anybody connected with the W. P. A., was trying to increase the rolls in order to affect the result of an election. If anybody is responsible or blamable for the increase in the W. P. A. rolls, it is the Congress of the United States.

On the day of the primary in Kentucky there were 69,000 on the rolls. From 40 to 50 percent of them were Republicans, and are now Republicans. They have not been fired. They could not vote in the Democratic primaries. Taking a conservative figure of 40 percent, and subtracting that figure from 69,000, we have left 41,735. One-third of those who were left

were not registered, and therefore they could not vote in the primary election. That left 27,000. One-third of those who were registered did not vote, and when we deduct that number from the figure we have, the number left is 18,525.

I have no way of knowing how many of those left voted for me. I assume a majority of them would have done so as a matter of course, because they were working on a program which I as a Senator had helped to bring about. However, I never electioneered with a single one of them. I never visited any of them. I did not go into the W. P. A. headquarters of the State in Kentucky, nor in any region, nor in any county.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that his time has expired, unless he requests an extension.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to ask for an extension. However, if there is no objection, I should like to have the 5 minutes which was taken out of my time by yielding a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may have 5 minutes additional.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may continue for 5 minutes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I follow the old democratic principle of special privileges to none. Although I know the occasion is a very important one for my distinguished friend, I shall have to object to any extension at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me conclude with one sentence: The majority which I received in the primary was 72,000. If I had not received a single vote from W. P. A. workers in Kentucky, my majority would have been at least 60,000; so, though I am grateful for the W. P. A. votes I received as for all the votes that I received, the result was not determined by that vote.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for the patient attention it has given me. I am sorry I have not a little more time. However, I am content to leave the verdict with the Senate.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum in order that Senators who are absent may be called to the Chamber before this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of no quorum being made, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Frazier	Lee	Reynolds
Andrews	George	Lewis	Russell
Ashurst	Gerry	Lodge	Schwartz
Austin	Gibson	Logan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Gillette	Lucas	Sheppard
Barbour	Glass	Lundeen	Shipstead
Barkley	Green	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Guffey	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Gurney	McNary	Stewart
Bridges	Hale	Maloney	Taft
Bulow	Harrison	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Hatch	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Hayden	Minton	Tobey
Caraway	Herring	Murray	Townsend
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Neely	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Norris	Tydings
Connally	Holt	Nye	Vandenberg
Danaher	Hughes	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Wagner
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	White
Ellender	King	Radcliffe	Wiley
	La Follette	Reed	

Mr. LEWIS. I beg again to announce the absence of certain Senators, and the reasons therefor, as given by me on a previous roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harry L. Hopkins, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland is excused from voting.

Mr. LEWIS. I am authorized to announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is absent because of illness, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who are absent on important public business, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained in the State of Massachusetts attending a conference of New England Governors on the New England flood-control program. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—58

Adams	Frazier	Lucas	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gillette	Lundeen	Reynolds
Ashurst	Green	McCarran	Russell
Bankhead	Guffey	McKellar	Schwartz
Barkley	Harrison	Maloney	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Hatch	Mead	Sheppard
Bone	Hayden	Miller	Smathers
Bulow	Herring	Minton	Smith
Byrnes	Hill	Murray	Stewart
Caraway	Hughes	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Norris	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Nye	Truman
Connally	Lee	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Downey	Lewis	Pepper	
Ellender	Logan	Pittman	

NAYS—27

Austin	George	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Barbour	Gerry	King	Townsend
Borah	Gibson	Lodge	Vandenberg
Bridges	Gurney	McNary	Van Nuys
Capper	Hale	Reed	White
Danaher	Holman	Shipstead	Wiley
Davis	Holt	Taft	

NOT VOTING—11

Bailey	Byrd	Glass	Walsh
Brown	Chavez	Overton	Wheeler
Burke	Donahey	Tydings	

So the nomination of Harry L. Hopkins, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the remainder of the nominations on the calendar be called, and in that connection I wish to say to the Senate that as soon as that is done it is expected to resume legislative session and make House Joint Resolution 83, the relief appropriation measure, the unfinished business, and then recess until tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations remaining on the calendar.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment in the Army.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

HEALTH OF THE NATION (H. DOC. NO. 120)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my annual message to the Congress I referred to problems of health security. I take occasion now to bring this subject specifically to your attention in transmitting the report and recommendations on national health prepared by the Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities.

The health of the people is a public concern; ill health is a major cause of suffering, economic loss, and dependency; good health is essential to the security and progress of the Nation.

Health needs were studied by the Committee on Economic Security which I appointed in 1934, and certain basic steps were taken by the Congress in the Social Security Act. It was recognized at that time that a comprehensive health program was required as an essential link in our national defenses against individual and social insecurity. Further study, however, seemed necessary at that time to determine ways and means of providing this protection most effectively.

In August 1935, after the passage of the Social Security Act, I appointed the Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities. Early in 1938 this committee forwarded to me reports prepared by their technical experts. They had reviewed unmet health needs, pointing to the desirability of a national health program, and they submitted the outlines of such a program. These reports were impressive. I therefore suggested that a conference be held to bring the findings before representatives of the general public and of the medical, public health, and allied professions.

More than 200 men and women, representing many walks of life and many parts of our country, came together in Washington last July to consider the technical committee's findings and recommendations and to offer further proposals. There was agreement on two basic points: The existence of serious unmet needs for medical service; and our failure to make full application of the growing powers of medical science to prevent or control disease and disability.

I have been concerned by the evidence of inequalities that exist among the States as to personnel and facilities for health services. There are equally serious inequalities of resources, medical facilities, and services in different sections and among different economic groups. These inequalities create handicaps for the parts of our country and the groups of our people which most sorely need the benefits of modern medical science.

The objective of a national health program is to make available in all parts of our country and for all groups of our people the scientific knowledge and skill at our command to prevent and care for sickness and disability; to safeguard mothers, infants, and children; and to offset through social insurance the loss of earnings among workers who are temporarily or permanently disabled.

The committee does not propose a great expansion of Federal health services. It recommends that plans be worked out and administered by States and localities with the assistance of Federal grants-in-aid. The aim is a flexible program. The committee points out that while the eventual costs of the proposed program would be considerable, they

represent a sound investment which can be expected to wipe out, in the long run, certain costs now borne in the form of relief.

We have reason to derive great satisfaction from the increase in the average length of life in our country and from the improvement in the average levels of health and well-being. Yet these improvements in the averages are cold comfort to the millions of our people whose security in health and survival is still as limited as was that of the Nation as a whole 50 years ago.

The average level of health or the average cost of sickness has little meaning for those who now must meet personal catastrophes. To know that a stream is 4 feet deep on the average is of little help to those who drown in the places where it is 10 feet deep. The recommendations of the committee offer a program to bridge that stream by reducing the risks of needless suffering and death, and of costs and dependency, that now overwhelm millions of individual families and sap the resources of the Nation.

I recommend the report of the Interdepartmental Committee for careful study by the Congress. The essence of the program recommended by the Committee is Federal-State cooperation. Federal legislation necessarily precedes, for it indicates the assistance which may be made available to the States in a cooperative program for the Nation's health.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1939.

Mr. WAGNER. I ask that the President's message with the Interdepartmental Committee report which accompanies it be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESEARCH—A NATIONAL RESOURCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, a report entitled "Research—A National Resource," compiled by the National Resources Committee.

This report deals with the relation of the Federal Government to research. Subsequent reports in this field will cover research by colleges, universities and foundations, by business organizations, by the industrial laboratories, and by the State and municipal governments.

The dependence of civilization on science is universally recognized, but the extent of the activities of private and public agencies carrying on scientific inquiry is not generally known. It is unlikely that large numbers of our people have any adequate realization of the services which are being rendered by the executive agencies of the Federal Government through scientific researches in medicine, agriculture, economics, public administration, and the other natural and social sciences.

This report indicates the new emphasis in recent years on activities in the social science fields and stresses the need for effective coordination of all agencies engaged in research in order to achieve the solution of many of our more difficult problems.

I commend the report to the consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1939.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds,

allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1938, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1939.

[Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.]

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 9)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, amounting to \$33,665.29 (considered and adjusted pursuant to law), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 10)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, in the sum of \$1,122,354.01, under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of law, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 11)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation to pay certain judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to \$131,236.89, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. DOC. NO. 12)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, amounting to \$27,918.62, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 13)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$7,467.45, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES DUE TO MILITARY OPERATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 14)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation to pay a claim for damages due to military operations, amounting to \$785 (considered and adjusted under the provisions of law), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES INCIDENT TO OPERATIONS OF NAVAL VESSELS (S. DOC. NO. 15)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations to pay claims for damages from collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, amounting to \$9,474.92 (considered and adjusted under the provisions of law), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS CAUSED BY EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (S. DOC. NO. 16)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for damages to any person or damages to or loss of privately owned property caused by employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, amounting to \$215.47 (considered and adjusted under the provisions of law), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 17)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$1,327.44, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS UNDER RIVER AND HARBOR WORK (S. DOC. NO. 18)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations to pay claims for damages amounting to \$1,047.22, adjusted under the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of June 5, 1920, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS ON ACCOUNT OF OPERATIONS OF COAST GUARD VESSELS (S. DOC. NO. 19)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation to pay claims for damages on account of operations of vessels of the Coast Guard, amounting to \$549.58 (considered and adjusted under the provisions of law), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 20)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Senate, amounting to \$265,000, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1937, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY PROPERTY, TUSKEGEE, ALA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exchange certain property located at Veterans' Administration facility, Tuskegee, Ala., for property of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring the enactment of legislation making the 3½-percent interest rate permanent to farmers borrowing from the Federal Land Bank and the Land Bank Commissioner and extending all principal payments of Land Bank Commissioner loans over a period of 34 years, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. GILLETTE, p. 633.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Producers' Council, of New York City, favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the operation of title 1 of the National Housing Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive board of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., favoring the reappointment of Donald Wakefield Smith as a member of the National Labor Relations Board, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive board of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., favoring retention of the National Labor Relations Act, and protesting against any alteration or amendment of that Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive board of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., favoring an appropriation of \$5,225,000 to be expended by the National Labor Relations Board during the coming fiscal year in effectuating the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of several citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the South Jersey Port Commission, an agency of the State of New Jersey, at Camden, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation exempting vessels of less than 200 registered tons from the requirements of Draft Convention No. 53, concerning the minimum requirement of professional capacity for masters and officers on board merchant ships, adopted by the International Labor Conference at Geneva and ratified by the United States as a treaty June 13, 1938, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Ray Current Events Club, Inc., of New York City, favoring a constitutional amendment making the Presidential term 6 years without a reelection, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Philadelphia Joint Board Waist and Dressmakers' Union, I. L. G. W. U., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an appropriation of \$875,000,000 for the Works Progress Administration, as proposed by the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a petition signed by W. P. A. workers, and Workers Alliance members, of Corcoran, Calif., praying for an appropriation by Congress sufficient to continue the Works Progress Administration and provide necessary work for the unemployed, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by Local No. 6, Rural Electrification Administration Union, Washington, D. C., and Local No. 5, Workers Alliance of Utah, of Sandy, Utah, favoring an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000, so as to continue the W. P. A. to the end of the present fiscal year with its existing quota of workers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of sundry members of President Local No. 80, United Federal Workers of America, of Alexandria, Va., praying for an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for the W. P. A., to provide work for the unemployed until the end of the present fiscal year, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the shipment of arms and munitions to Japan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. REED presented a petition of 75 citizens of Ford and Edwards Counties, Kans., praying that the Spanish arms embargo be not lifted, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of 59 citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., praying for the retention of the existing embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of 20 citizens of Parsons, Kans., praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, and also praying for an investigation of leftist groups sponsoring propaganda favoring the lifting of the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of 73 citizens of Barton, Kingman, Rice, McPherson, and Russell Counties, Kans., praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of 39 citizens of Osborne, 52 citizens of Marion, 57 citizens of Atwood, and 158 citizens of Bourbon and Sumner Counties, all in the State of Kansas, praying that the United States stop the shipment of such goods and munitions as may be used by the military forces of Japan in their present Chinese operations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MALONEY presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Local No. 320, Bridgeport Brass Workers Union, of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for an appropriation of \$875,000,000 for the Works Progress Administration, as proposed by the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Patrick McNally and 34 other citizens of New Haven, Conn., praying for the preservation of peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Bridgeport (Conn.) Council of Catholic Men, protesting against lifting the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the legislative committee, Catholic Daughters of America for the State of Connecticut, at Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against lifting the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petitions of Michael J. Riley, John L. Robinson, Joseph P. Mulcunry, and 21 other citizens, and Anthony Castaldi and 118 other citizens, all of Waterbury, Conn., praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Greek American Educational Society, Philomathia, of New Britain, Conn., praying that the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain be lifted, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions from Arthur J. Rinaud and 37 other citizens and George Varriale and 5 other citizens of New Britain; Court Reina Christina, No. 51, Catholic Daughters of America, of Bridgeport; Elizabeth A. Martin and 23 other citizens of Derby; P. H. Regan and 107 other citizens of Naugatuck; James C. Sullivan and 4 other citizens, and Rev. William F. Odell, pastor, and members of St. Mary's Parish, of New London; Rev. Lawrence W. Doucette, director of the Study Clubs of Moosup, South Covehtry, Danielson, Norwichtown, Colchester, Stafford Springs, Willimantic, Jewett City, Taftville, North Grosvenor Dale, Versailles, Norwich, Pomfret, Plainfield, Putnam, Wauregan, and Montville; Carl

Storek, of Norwich; the Hartford Council of Catholic Women, by Elizabeth F. Bagley, secretary, of Hartford; Richard Walling and 42 other citizens, and Harold E. Nagle and 125 other citizens, of Stamford; Mrs. E. Connell and James Connelly, of Stratford; Lorene G. Doyle and 35 other citizens, of Fairfield; Windhorst Society of St. Mary's Parish, by Frank Rewinkel, president, of Meriden; Thomas A. Foley and 4 other citizens, Mr. and Mrs. George L. Sills and 122 other citizens, and the Waterbury Council of Catholic Women, by Kathryn W. Hayes, president, of Waterbury; and the Catholic Daughters of America, by Mary Hughes Schread, chairman of State legislative committee, all in the State of Connecticut, praying that the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain be not lifted, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GILLETTE presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Whereas the welfare of the great Commonwealth of Iowa depends upon the stabilization of agriculture; and

Whereas long-term loans and low interest rates help materially to stabilize the agricultural industry; and

Whereas the emergency farm-loan interest rate of 3½ percent, made possible by special action of the National Congress to the farmer borrowers having Federal land-bank loans, expires July 1, 1940, and the emergency farm-loan interest rate of 4 percent, made possible by a special act of the National Congress to the farmer borrowers having Land Bank Commissioner loans, expires July 1, 1940; and

Whereas the Land Bank Commissioner loans provide for principal payments of 5 percent or 10 percent per annum in addition to the interest payments; and

Whereas thousands of farmers in the State of Iowa have Federal land-bank and/or Land Bank Commissioner loans, and because of the fact that the interest rates are not definitely fixed at a low rate and because of the fact that principal payments of at least 5 percent or 10 percent per annum are required on Land Bank Commissioner loans, there is much uncertainty and indefiniteness in the plans of such farmer borrowers; and

Whereas it appears to be possible to extend lower interest rates to the farmers without an excessive burden to the taxpayer and with almost no administrative costs and that interest rates on Government loans to other industries is considerably less than that fixed for the farmer of the Middle West; and

Whereas it is our opinion that low interest rates and small principal payments accorded to the farmers of Iowa through the Federal land-bank system would contribute much to the stabilization of agriculture: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Iowa, duly assembled in Des Moines, Iowa, respectfully petitions the Members of the National Congress to use every possible effort to secure the passage of a law making 3½-percent interest rate permanent to the farmer borrowers of the Federal land-bank and the Land Bank Commissioner and that this legislature urges the Members of the National Congress to secure the passage of a law extending all principal payments on Land Bank Commissioner loans over a period of 34 years as provided for Federal land-bank loans, and that the said be made permanent and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and Representative from the State of Iowa, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the President of the United States.

PHOSPHATE RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 21)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, to be filed on behalf of the Joint Committee on Phosphate Resources appointed at the last session, the report of that committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has just made a report on behalf of the joint committee appointed at the last session of Congress to investigate the phosphate question. I should like to ask the Chair what was done with that report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. NORRIS. How many copies will be printed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the usual number of copies is about 1,100.

Mr. NORRIS. It will be printed in pamphlet form, as Senate documents are usually printed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 92) to au-

thorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 5) thereon.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR HEARINGS, FUNERAL EXPENSES, ETC.

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, a number of resolutions, and ask unanimous consent for their consideration at this time.

There being no objection, the resolutions were considered by unanimous consent, and severally agreed to, as follows:

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Senate Resolution 14, submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri, on January 4, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals hereby is authorized to employ during the Seventy-sixth Congress an assistant clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,000 per annum.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Senate Resolution 18, submitted by Mr. LOGAN on January 4, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims hereby is authorized to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum and \$1,800 additional so long as the position is held by the first incumbent appointed under this authority.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Senate Resolution 30, submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on January 5, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 111, Seventy-third Congress, agreed to January 19, 1934, and continued by subsequent resolutions through the Seventy-fifth Congress, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,000 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS

Senate Resolution 33, submitted by Mrs. CARAWAY on January 5, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Enrolled Bills hereby is authorized to employ for the remainder of the present session an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Senate Resolution 46, submitted by Mr. ASHURST on January 9, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary hereby is authorized to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$960 per annum until the end of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Senate Resolution 47, submitted by Mr. RUSSELL on January 9, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 57, Seventy-fifth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1937, and continued by subsequent resolutions through the Seventy-fifth Congress, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR COPELAND

Senate Resolution 48, submitted by Mr. WAGNER on January 9, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Royal S. Copeland, late a Senator from the State of New York, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Senate Resolution 50, submitted by Mr. BAILEY on January 10, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a

stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Senate Resolution 51, submitted by Mr. McKellar on January 10, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words; to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Senate Resolution 55, submitted by Mr. Walsh on January 12, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Senate Resolution 56, submitted by Mr. Lewis on January 12, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

ELIZABETH PINKETT

Senate Resolution 59, submitted by Mr. Radcliffe on January 16, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Elizabeth Pinkett, widow of James F. Pinkett, late a laborer in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Senate Resolution 65, submitted by Mr. Smith on January 19, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Senate Resolution 66, submitted by Mr. Bankhead on January 19, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Senate Resolution 67, submitted by Mr. Barkley on January 19, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths,

and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Senate Resolution 68, submitted by Mr. Connally on January 19, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 29, submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Thomas] on January 5, 1939, authorizing the employment of an assistant clerk by the Committee on Education and Labor, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 5, after the words "per annum", to strike out "and an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor hereby is authorized to employ, beginning January 3, 1939, for the duration of the Seventy-sixth Congress, an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,000 per annum.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 38, providing additional funds for the expenses of the Special Joint Congressional Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. KING. I ask that the joint resolution go over. I should like to inquire into it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OMAHONEY:

S. 878. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1937; and S. 879. A bill to encourage the employment of local capital in the mining of oil and gas on the public domain; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 880. A bill for the relief of W. B. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

S. 881. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 882. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 883. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. McMahon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOGAN:

S. 884. A bill for the relief of disbursing officers and other officers and employees of the United States for disallowances and charges on account of airplane travel; and

S. 885. A bill to authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credit for all outstanding disallowances and suspensions in the accounts of the disbursing officers or agents of the Government for payments made to certain employees appointed by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 886. A bill granting a pension to Charles G. Hostutler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 887. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Byrd; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 888. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act (June 26, 1934, ch. 750-1, 48 Stat. 1216, sec. 1759), in order to facilitate the organization of rural credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 889. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of \$15 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 890. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of maximum age in employment directly and indirectly under the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 891. A bill for the relief of J. C. Grice; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHURST:

S. 892. A bill to change the designation of the Petrified Forest National Monument, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 893. A bill relating to buildings to be erected for use by the District of Columbia for inspection stations of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 894. A bill to create a World War Memorial Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of suitable memorials, monuments, or buildings at ports or cities in the United States from which American forces embarked for World War service in foreign countries and to which American forces returned after such service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 895. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:

S. 896. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the admission of Wyoming into the Union as the first State guaranteeing equal suffrage to women; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 897. A bill to correct the military record of Walter Ballhaus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

S. 898. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Ashton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 899. A bill to promote the efficiency of the Air Corps;

S. 900. A bill to authorize the loan of aircraft and aeronautical equipment to civilian aviation schools; and

S. 901. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction and rehabilitation at military posts in the Panama Canal Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

S. 902. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," ap-

proved May 25, 1938; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 903. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers of the Army to enter into agreements with local governments adjacent to the District of Columbia for the use of water for purposes of fire fighting only; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 904. A bill to constitute the master-at-arms force and the guards (watchmen) force at the United States Naval Academy the "United States Naval Academy Police," to fix their compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Franklin;

S. 906. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of Lucius Hudson Holt as a colonel, United States Army; and

S. 907. A bill to authorize the award of the Purple Heart decoration to Maj. Charles H. Sprague; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 908. A bill granting an increase in pension to Martha J. Griffin; and

S. 909. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth D. Dunavent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 910. A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Roscoe C. Prescott; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 912. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. TOBEY also introduced Senate bill 913, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to amend the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937 with respect to grants or loans for certain school projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALVAGE OF TIMBER IN NEW ENGLAND—REDUCTION OF FIRE HAZARD

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and ask to have it printed in full in the RECORD. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire will be received, printed in the RECORD and properly referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 913) authorizing an appropriation for full payment of the approved schedules of prices for salvaged timber products purchased or to be purchased by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill authorizing an appropriation for full payment of the approved schedules of prices for salvaged timber products purchased or to be purchased by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration, and for other purposes

Whereas the hurricane of September 1938 left great areas in the New England States devastated and the forests in those areas a tangled mass of fallen timber, causing financial loss to more than 20,000 farm owners whose subsistence depended on their timber; and

Whereas, in order to prevent suffering and give aid in restoration of financial stability to these farm owners, it became necessary for

the Federal Government to put into effect a program of work to reduce fire hazard and a timber-salvage operation to recover some part of the destroyed wealth of these States; and

Whereas the fire hazard now existing threatens a disaster to life and property which can be lessened by accelerating the salvage operation; and

Whereas the powers hitherto granted by the Congress to the executive branch of the Government are inadequate to meet the urgent needs of this stricken area: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000, to be immediately available and to continue available until expended, which shall be used for paying the difference between the approved schedules of prices for salvaged timber products purchased or to be purchased from the owners thereof by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration, and the amounts paid from funds loaned by the Disaster Loan Corporation to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration, and for necessary administrative expenses (including printing and binding) in connection with the timber-salvaging operations conducted by the Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$4,000,000, to be immediately available and to continue available until expended, for paying the owners thereof at the rate of \$2.50 per thousand board feet for logs heretofore or hereafter delivered to and accepted by the Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration, which payment shall be in addition to that provided for in section 1 of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

I have introduced this bill after making a careful study of the timber disaster which affects New England and part of New York, feeling that prompt action by the Government is imperative, not only from the standpoint of fair treatment to the timber owners for losses they have already sustained, but more particularly with the view to taking definite action to aid in the necessary campaign to reduce the fire hazard which is now existing in this area and which is increasing with the passage of each week.

The United States Forest Service has reported that without adequate aid from the Federal Government to reduce the fire hazard it is well within the bounds of reason that such a serious holocaust might occur during the coming fire season as to far exceed the hurricane of September in resulting loss of life and property. Furthermore, says the report, a fire would cause irreparable damage to the forests of the future in elimination of the remaining live timber on extensive areas.

I have talked with officials in the Forest Service and have been advised that if such a devastation should occur it would take 50 years after replanting for pine to become of merchantable age, 60 years for spruce, and approximately 100 years for northern hardwoods.

In the office of Mr. Silcox I have seen pictures of severe forest fires over large areas in other parts of the country and appreciate the seriousness of our New England situation.

At the present time the Federal Government is paying the timber owner 90 percent of the schedule of prices for timber delivered to the ponds or to the sawmills. The great practical difficulty has been lack of sufficient inducement to warrant the timber owner to accept the Federal proposal and operate the lumber for delivery to the places designated by the Government. This bill seeks to furnish that inducement.

Section 1 provides for the payment of 100 percent of the delivered value of the timber, purchase to be made at the point of delivery. Under that plan alone the timber owner would still stand to lose on his investment, for, according to estimates of the United States Forest Service, made after a survey of the tangled conditions of our timberlands as of last October, it would cost the timber owner approximately \$2 per thousand feet more to cut the timber and transport it to the point of delivery than it would under normal circumstances.

Unless one has seen the condition of our timberlands with his own eyes it is impossible for him to visualize the picture. In the few hours of the hurricane at least half of the timber in New Hampshire became an ugly mass of crisscrossed waste, a mass of broken, twisted, and splintered wood, carrying with it the life savings of thousands of families and the wealth that was to have put children through college or provide funds for many of our older people in their last years.

Due to increased demand for trucks and labor as a result of the down-timber conditions, it has been estimated that this additional cost has now risen from \$2 to \$2.50.

Therefore, under section 2 of this bill, I have provided that the Federal Government pay the timber owner a bonus of two dollars and a half for each thousand board feet of logs which he brings to the designated point of delivery.

The Forest Service has estimated that from one billion to one and six-tenths billion feet can be salvaged up to the end of June, the deadline of the period during which the timber is salvageable.

Based upon these figures, the appropriation called for is \$4,000,000. I believe that this twofold plan would be an inducement sufficient to effect the acceptance by the timber owner of the Federal purchase plan, and will thereby greatly reduce the fire hazard.

The Forest Service has estimated that there are from two and a half to four billion feet of merchantable timber down, as of its report of January 14. It reports that as of January 14, 450,000,000

to 500,000,000 feet of timber had been contracted for delivery and that the logs actually received on that date totaled 30,000,000 to 32,000,000 feet.

It can well be seen from these figures that unless the Federal Government takes further action immediately for fire-risk reduction the hazard will increase and will threaten the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property as well as loss of human life.

The Federal investment of the \$4,000,000 to provide for such payment of \$2.50 per 1,000 board-feet is a small one when we consider the potential future loss by fire of hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property, which will result if this fire hazard is not materially reduced.

I urge that this bill be given immediate consideration by the committee and that the Congress act with the least possible delay in enacting it into a law.

CLAIM OF MEMPHIS, TENN.—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 671) for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases from \$2,000,000 to \$5,300,000, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2868, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 2, line 15, after the figures "1939", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That not later than 30 days following the approval of this joint resolution the Works Progress Administration shall determine and fix the number of hours per month of workers employed upon works-progress projects that the monthly security wage for workers shall not be lower in any area than that paid to workers in that same occupation in areas of the same general type within the same security wage region regardless of variations in county population."

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of national representation for the District of Columbia, delivered by Senator CAPPER at a meeting of the General Federation of Women's Clubs at Washington, D. C., January 19, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMAMENT PROGRAM AND FOREIGN RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator TAFT on the American Forum of the Air on Sunday, January 22, 1939, on the subject Armament and Our Foreign Policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY ALFRED M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of foreign relations, delivered by Hon. Alfred M. Landon on January 21, 1939, at Topeka, Kans., before the Kansas Press Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEUTRALITY—ARTICLE BY CHARLES A. BEARD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles A. Beard on the subject of neutrality, published in the New Republic for January 18, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCRAP IRON

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of January 22, 1939, under the headline "Scrap Iron," which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF SILVER PROGRAM

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from additional letters received by him with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 1, providing for the appointment of a special joint committee to investigate the silver program, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE WRIGHT AIRPLANE—EDITORIAL FROM MIAMI HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Miami Herald of January 6, 1939, relative to the Wright airplane, which appears in the Appendix.]

MUNICIPALLY OWNED POWER SYSTEM IN TACOMA, WASH.

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Tacoma, Wash., Sunday Ledger on January 1, 1939, with reference to the Tacoma municipally owned power system, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM LIBERTY

[Mr. LUNDEEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD part of an editorial from Liberty for January 28, 1939, entitled "Shall We Be Forced Into War by Reckless Officials?" which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIEF—ARTICLE BY DR. GEORGE GALLUP

[Mr. HOLT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dr. George Gallup on the subject of relief, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 22, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOLD: A BUSINESS RESTORATIVE—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 18, 1939, entitled "Gold: A Business Restorative," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 83.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 17), 1939

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Thomas R. Amlie, of Wisconsin, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1945, vice Balthasar H. Meyer, term expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from May 27, 1938:

John Montrello
Gilbert F. Schumacher
Charles Tighe
Fred L. Westbrook
Richard Baxter
Oscar D. Weed, Jr.
Ralph D. Dean
Joseph R. Scullion
William J. Conley, Jr.

Richard L. Mellen
Glenn L. Rollins
Ernest A. Cascini
Frank V. Helmer
Robert F. Shunk
Donald W. Weller
Justus P. White
William J. Lawrence

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 17), 1939

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Harry L. Hopkins to be Secretary of Commerce.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Brig. Gen. Henry Harley Arnold to be Chief of the Air Corps with the rank of major general.

Col. Walter Glenn Kilner (lieutenant colonel) to be Assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps with the rank of brigadier general.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

William Henry Wilson
Robert McCandless Beck, Jr.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Edmund Leo Daley
Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright
Adna Romanza Chaffee
Daniel Isom Sultan
Maxwell Murray
William Edgar Shedd, Jr.

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

TO BE WING COMMANDERS WITH THE RANK OF BRIGADIER GENERAL

Walter Hale Frank
Herbert Arthur Dargue

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Ralph Emerson Truman to be major general.
William Leslie Hornor to be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Ralph Maxwell Immell
Walter Braxton Pyron
Alexander Edward Anderson
Richard Eugene Mittelstaedt
Diller Slyder Myers
Edward Clark Rose
Leonard Fish Wing

REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS, INACTIVE RESERVE

Brig. Gen. John Ross Delafield.
Brig. Gen. Samuel McRoberts.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Deedy Newsome, Arkinda.
Ocie E. Mathis, Hackett.

NEW MEXICO

Robert F. Fisher, Cuba.
James C. Wyman, Loving.

NORTH CAROLINA

Jethro M. Rollins, Bostic.
Eli H. Ange, Jamesville.
Virginia D. Martin, Parkton.
Derr L. Hines, Stony Point.
Maude F. Cheatham, Youngsville.

VERMONT

Bert G. Peck, East Middlebury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John Compton Ball, pastor of the Metropolitan Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, O Lord, do we lift our souls for the activities of a new day, and with joy in our hearts and praises on our lips we acknowledge Thy holiness, wisdom, power, and

loving kindness. We thank Thee for life and the blessings bestowed upon us as a nation, and pray that we may stand firm for the privileges given us by the sacrifices of our forefathers.

To this end, endure our President with divine wisdom. Give to our beloved Speaker of this House of Representatives the guidance of Thy Holy Spirit in his leadership and decisions. May every Member be motivated not by the fear of men but by faith in God; for, conscious of the needs of our constituents and the great national problems that confront us, we feel unequal to the task unless we possess wisdom from on high. So we plead for Thy continued guidance this day and every day; and as the physical sunshine floods the land with light, so may our hearts be illuminated and warmed by the sunshine of Thy divine presence and love. In the name of Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 20, 1939, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO REPLACEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 28.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 28

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44 of the Seventy-fourth Congress and House Resolution 11 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1941, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, for necessary legislation. Any unexpended balance of the total amount authorized for the use of the said special committee under House Resolution 97 of the Seventy-fifth Congress is hereby continued available until said date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia tell us how much unexpended money is in the Treasury available to the committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I could not tell the gentleman the exact amount, but enough to finish the work of the committee for the full calendar year of 1939. This appropriation was made available to us in 1937 and we worked during 1937 and 1938 and we will have enough to work throughout 1939 out of the one appropriation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does the gentleman propose to do for the year 1940?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We will ask for enough money to continue the work of the committee during that time, and I may say to the gentleman there has never been a special investigating committee of the House that has operated for as little money or has saved the Government more money than this Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us in a few words what his committee has accomplished and what he hopes to accomplish?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have coordinated the conservation activities of the emergency agencies; we have coordinated the regular departments with these emergency agencies; and we have directed the tremendous expenditures of the C. C. C. camps into very constructive channels in preserving a great natural resource, the wildlife of the country, in building dams and reservoirs to check the run-off and to restore water levels. We have cooperated with the Soil Conservation Service, and only on the 10th of this month were we able to get an amendment to the regulation paying soil-improvement benefits to

farmers to cover the planting of annuals and perennials, legumes, and shrubs for the improvement of the habitat of wildlife. There are literally millions of acres of waste or arid lands serving no purpose, not suited for agriculture. We can build that land up or encourage the farmers to do so through cooperative agreements, instruction in farm management, and by distributing free Korean lespedeza, for instance, a soil builder, and a soil holder, and a wonderful food supply for birds of all kinds. The past work of our committee and plans for the future were summarized in a 29-page report submitted to the House on January 3.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It strikes me the committee has quite a program and the gentleman might well consider having this committee made a standing committee of the House. Has the committee given any consideration to that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There has been a big demand for that to be done, but we have not asked for it, for two reasons. In the first place, a standing committee would be more expensive to the Congress. In the second place, under the plan under which the Democrats work, a member of an exclusive committee cannot be a member of any minor committee, and this would exclude from membership on this committee those with technical knowledge of what is to be done because they all have major committee assignments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made out a very good case and I have no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice this resolution was introduced on January 3 and referred to the Committee on Rules. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if he has made any request of the chairman of the committee to report the resolution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have, and he said last week he would be very glad to report it, but he had not had the members assigned to his committee. The chairman is now out of the city on important business, I understand, and will not be back until the last of the week. I am sure he would have no objection, because he is in thorough sympathy with the resolution. We have a large volume of work to be handled all the time, and there should be no break in the committee's activities.

Mr. MAPES. Has the gentleman from Virginia spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Rules about calling it up in this way?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, because he is out of the city; but I am sure I can say that he would have no objection, as we have handled it previously in this way. In 1935 we handled it by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, I realize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the chairman of the committee, is able to take care of himself, but let me say to the gentleman from Virginia, first, as he knows, I am very much in favor of the work which he has been doing as chairman of this committee, but let me say further that there are several resolutions of this nature pending before the Committee on Rules, and it seems to me there is some question about the form of the resolution and some other questions which ought to be considered by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is in the exact language of previous resolutions, and on one previous occasion we handled the resolution in this manner by unanimous consent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the continuance of this committee, but I shall object to its present consideration because it is subject to a point of order. The resolution should not be brought in in the form in which it is presented. I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and to in-

clude therein several brief addresses delivered at the dedicatory exercises of a Federal building in Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. On Friday last I offered for the RECORD, by asking unanimous consent, an article written by one of our colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON]. That unanimous-consent request was refused through the objection of a gentleman on the majority side. What I would like to know is whether or not we are still operating under the rules which I have understood to prevail, to the effect that articles by Members themselves are not objected to when they are offered for the RECORD.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman does not expect me to answer that question.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I think it is incumbent upon me to respond to my good friend and colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] because I objected to his offering the article in question on Friday last. It is not my intention, nor is it the intention, as far as I know, of anyone on the majority side, to object to the inclusion of remarks of Members themselves if made by a Member, whether of the majority or the minority party, over the radio, or to the inclusion of brief editorials; but it seems to me that the Joint Committee on Printing ought to consider whether we are going to be permitted to put whole books into the RECORD. This particular article would have taken up so many pages in the RECORD that I objected to it, and I shall continue to object to anything like that, whether it comes from my own side or the Republican side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman thoroughly well knows that articles that go far beyond what the gentleman from Indiana offered, so far as the number of pages is concerned, have been permitted to be placed in the RECORD, and the gentleman has been silent, so far as I know, when they were offered.

Mr. BUCK. Oh, the gentleman knows that I have not been here during the sessions when everything has been offered. I appreciate the position of the minority leader in this matter, but it strikes me that he and the majority leader and the Committee on Printing ought to get together and adopt some definite policy as to what is going to go into the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That could not be done, and the majority leader has admitted it. Consequently we take the attitude that if gentlemen on that side object to our requests, we will object to their requests.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. HALLECK. I object.

ACTING CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

January 23, 1939.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers for me which he would be authorized to sign by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III of the House. Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

NATIONAL RESOURCE (H. DOC. NO. 122)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report entitled "Research—a National Resource," compiled by the National Resources Committee.

This report deals with the relation of the Federal Government to research. Subsequent reports in this field will cover research by colleges, universities and foundations, by business organizations, by the industrial laboratories, and by the State and municipal governments.

The dependence of civilization on science is universally recognized, but the extent of the activities of private and public agencies carrying on scientific inquiry is not generally known. It is unlikely that large numbers of our people have any adequate realization of the services which are being rendered by the executive agencies of the Federal Government through scientific researches in medicine, agriculture, economics, public administration, and the other natural and social sciences.

This report indicates the new emphasis in recent years on activities in the social-science fields and stresses the need for effective coordination of all agencies engaged in research in order to achieve the solution of many of our more difficult problems.

I commend the report to the consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1939.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT (H. DOC. NO. 121)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1938, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1939.

PUBLIC HEALTH (H. DOC. NO. 120)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my annual message to the Congress I referred to problems of health security. I take occasion now to bring this subject specifically to your attention in transmitting the report and recommendations on national health prepared by the Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities.

The health of the people is a public concern, ill health is a major cause of suffering, economic loss, and dependency; good health is essential to the security and progress of the Nation.

Health needs were studied by the Committee on Economic Security which I appointed in 1934, and certain basic steps were taken by the Congress in the Social Security Act. It was recognized at that time that a comprehensive health program was required as an essential link in our national defenses against individual and social insecurity. Further study, however, seemed necessary at that time to determine ways and means of providing this protection most effectively.

In August 1935, after the passage of the Social Security Act, I appointed the Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities. Early in 1938, this committee forwarded to me reports prepared by their technical experts. They had reviewed unmet health needs, pointing to the desirability of a national health program, and they submitted the outlines of such a program. These reports were impressive. I therefore suggested that a conference be held to bring the findings before representatives of the general

public and of the medical, public health, and allied professions.

More than 200 men and women, representing many walks of life and many parts of our country, came together in Washington last July to consider the technical committee's findings and recommendations and to offer further proposals. There was agreement on two basic points: The existence of serious unmet needs for medical service; and our failure to make full application of the growing powers of medical science to prevent or control disease and disability.

I have been concerned by the evidence of inequalities that exist among the States as to personnel and facilities for health services. There are equally serious inequalities of resources, medical facilities, and services in different sections and among different economic groups. These inequalities create handicaps for the parts of our country and the groups of our people which most sorely need the benefits of modern medical science.

The objective of a national health program is to make available in all parts of our country and for all groups of our people the scientific knowledge and skill at our command to prevent and care for sickness and disability; to safeguard mothers, infants, and children; and to offset through social insurance the loss of earnings among workers who are temporarily or permanently disabled.

The committee does not propose a great expansion of Federal health services. It recommends that plans be worked out and administered by States and localities, with the assistance of Federal grants-in-aid. The aim is a flexible program. The committee points out that while the eventual costs of the proposed program would be considerable they represent a sound investment which can be expected to wipe out, in the long run, certain costs now borne in the form of relief.

We have reason to derive great satisfaction from the increase in the average length of life in our country and from the improvement in the average levels of health and well-being. Yet these improvements in the averages are cold comfort to the millions of our people whose security in health and survival is still as limited as was that of the Nation as a whole 50 years ago.

The average level of health or the average cost of sickness has little meaning for those who now must meet personal catastrophes. To know that a stream is 4 feet deep on the average is of little help to those who drown in the places where it is 10 feet deep. The recommendations of the committee offer a program to bridge that stream by reducing the risks of needless suffering and death, and of costs and dependency, that now overwhelm millions of individual families and sap the resources of the Nation.

I recommend the report of the Interdepartmental Committee for careful study by the Congress. The essence of the program recommended by the committee is Federal-State cooperation. Federal legislation necessarily precedes, for it indicates the assistance which may be made available to the States in a cooperative program for the Nation's health.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1939.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 64

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Accounts: James Wolfenden, Pennsylvania; Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Lewis D. Thill, Wisconsin; Fred C. Gartner, Pennsylvania.

Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; Fred C. Gilchrist, Iowa; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Bert Lord, New York; William Lemke, North Dakota; Ralph O. Brewster, Maine; Anton J. Johnson, Illinois; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Samuel W. King, Hawaii.

Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; Robert Luce, Massachusetts; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Richard M. Simpson,

Pennsylvania; Noble J. Johnson, Indiana; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Jessie Sumner, Illinois; William J. Miller, Connecticut.

Census: J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; Robert A. Grant, Indiana; Charles Hawks, Jr., Wisconsin; William H. Wheat, Illinois; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Leland M. Ford, California.

Civil Service: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Albert L. Vreeland, New Jersey; L. L. Marshall, Ohio; J. Francis Harter, New York;

Claims: J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; Lewis K. Rockefeller, New York; Thomas D. Winter, Kansas; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Leonard W. Hall, New York.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Robert Luce, Massachusetts; E. Harold Cluett, New York; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Fred C. Gartner, Pennsylvania; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio.

Disposition of Executive Papers: Bertrand W. Gearhart, California.

District of Columbia: Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Leland M. Ford, California; Stephen Bolles, Wisconsin; Albert L. Vreeland, New Jersey; James Secombe, Ohio.

Education: George A. Dondero, Michigan; Frank C. Osmer, Jr., New Jersey; Robert A. Grant, Indiana; Joshua L. Johns, Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania;

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: George Holden Tinkham, Massachusetts; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; George H. Heinke, Nebraska; Frank C. Osmer, Jr., New Jersey; Earl R. Lewis, Ohio.

Elections No. 1: Clarence E. Hancock, New York; L. L. Marshall, Ohio; Albert L. Vreeland, New Jersey.

Elections No. 2: Francis D. Culkin, New York; William W. Blackney, Michigan; John McDowell, Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 3: Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Lewis D. Thill, Wisconsin.

Enrolled Bills: Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; John G. Alexander, Minnesota; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania.

Expenditures in the Executive Department: Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; D. Lane Powers, New Jersey; Stephen Bolles, Wisconsin; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; Henry O. Talle, Iowa.

Flood Control: Harry L. Englebright, California; Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; Earl R. Lewis, Ohio; Harve Tibbott, Pennsylvania; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Thomas R. Ball, Connecticut; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota.

Foreign Affairs: Hamilton Fish, New York; Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; George Holden Tinkham, Massachusetts; Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Bruce Barton, New York; Robert B. Chipfield, Illinois; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Foster Stearns, New Hampshire; Andrew C. Schiffer, West Virginia.

Immigration and Naturalization: J. Will Taylor, Tennessee; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Lewis K. Rockefeller, New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; John Z. Anderson, California; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Samuel W. King, Hawaii.

Indian Affairs: Fred C. Gilchrist, Iowa; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Fred J. Douglas, New York; John C. Schafer, Wisconsin; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska.

Insular Affairs: Richard J. Welch, California; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Frank C. Osmer, Jr., New Jersey; William H. Wheat, Illinois; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Charles Hawks, Jr., Wisconsin; Samuel W. King, Hawaii.

Invalid Pensions: Ralph O. Brewster, Maine; John C. Schafer, Wisconsin; Robert F. Jones, Ohio; Stephen Bolles, Wisconsin; Robert A. Grant, Indiana; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania.

Irrigation and Reclamation: Dewey Short, Missouri; Charles Hawks, Jr., Wisconsin; Thomas D. Winter, Kansas; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; J. Thorkelson, Montana; Frank O. Horton, Wyoming.

Judiciary: U. S. Guyer, Kansas; Clarence E. Hancock, New York; Earl C. Michener, Michigan; John M. Robson, Kentucky; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Wallace E. Pierce, New York; B. J. Monkiewicz, Connecticut; Raymond S. Springer, Indiana.

Labor: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Clyde H. Smith, Maine; Bruce Barton, New York; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; George H. Heinke, Nebraska.

Library: Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; Bert Lord, New York. Memorials: Frank Crowther, New York.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Richard J. Welch, California; Francis D. Culkin, New York; George N. Seger, New Jersey; James C. Oliver, Maine; Joseph J. O'Brien, New York; Harry Sandager, Rhode Island; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Samuel W. King, Hawaii.

Military Affairs: Walter G. Andrews, New York; Dewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; Albert G. Rutherford, Pennsylvania; J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Forest A. Harness, Indiana; Samuel W. King, Hawaii.

Mines and Mining: Harry L. Englebright, California; John M. Robson, Kentucky; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Earl R. Lewis, Ohio; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Thomas D. Winter, Kansas.

Naval Affairs: Melvin J. Maas, Minnesota; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; James W. Mott, Oregon; W. Sterling Cole, New York; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio; George P. Darrow, Pennsylvania; Arthur B. Jenks, New Hampshire; Thomas M. Eaton, California; Walter S. Jeffries, New Jersey; Samuel W. King, Hawaii. Patents: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Robert Luce, Massachusetts; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; L. L. Marshall, Ohio.

Pensions: Fred J. Douglas, New York; Charles L. Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Harry N. Routzohn, Ohio; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; J. Francis Harter, New York; John G. Alexander, Minnesota;

Post Office and Post Roads: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; E. Harold Cluett, New York; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Charles F. Risk, Rhode Island; William W. Blackney, Michigan; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; Albert E. Austin, Connecticut; James Secombe, Ohio; George W. Gillie, Indiana; John McDowell, Pennsylvania.

Printing: Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania.

Public Buildings and Grounds: Pehr G. Holmes, Massachusetts; Clyde H. Smith, Maine; Albert G. Rutherford, Pennsylvania; John C. Schafer, Wisconsin; John Z. Anderson, California; Thomas R. Ball, Connecticut; Fred Bradley, Michigan.

Public Lands: Harry L. Englebright, California; James W. Wadsworth, New York; James W. Mott, Oregon; Fred J. Douglas, New York; J. Thorkelson, Montana; Frank O. Horton, Wyoming; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho;

Revision of the Laws: Earl C. Michener, Michigan; John M. Robison, Kentucky; Harry N. Routzohn, Ohio; Lewis D. Thill, Wisconsin.

Rivers and Harbors: George N. Seger, New Jersey; Albert E. Carter, California; Francis D. Cuklin, New York; George A. Dondoro, Michigan; William A. Pittenger, Minnesota; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; George S. Williams, Delaware; George H. Bender, Ohio; Harry W. Griswold, Wisconsin; Samuel W. King, Hawaii.

Roads: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; James W. Mott, Oregon; Cassius C. Dowell, Iowa; Robert F. Jones, Ohio; Frank O. Horton, Wyoming; Leland M. Ford, California; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota.

Territories: Cassius C. Dowell, Iowa; Lewis K. Rockefeller, New York; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Robert F. Jones, Ohio; J. Thorkelson, Montana; George H. Heinke, Nebraska; Joshua L. Johns, Wisconsin; Fred C. Gartner, Pennsylvania; Samuel W. King, Hawaii.

War Claims: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Clyde H. Smith, Maine; Harve Tibbott, Pennsylvania; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Joshua L. Johns, Wisconsin; Joseph J. O'Brien, New York;

World War Veterans: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; James C. Oliver, Maine; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Charles L. Gerlach, Pennsylvania; John G. Alexander, Minnesota; Harry N. Routzohn, Ohio; Leonard W. Hall, New York.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House while that committee is considering H. R. 2880.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Do I understand the gentleman is going to begin hearings on the naval construction bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; on Wednesday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When is it the gentleman's purpose to bring that bill to the House?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am hoping that we may be able to finish the work by at least this day one week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And will that give ample opportunity for everyone to be heard by the committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am sure that ample opportunity will be accorded everyone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the completion of the special orders on tomorrow, Tuesday, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LXXXIV—41

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made on Saturday, January 21, over the network of the National Broadcasting Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that.

Mr. HILL. These are my own remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was the gentleman's own remarks that were objected to on Friday by one of the Members on your side also.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—FISCAL YEAR 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2868, with Mr. Doxey in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday last, there was pending a point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, at the time the Committee rose on Friday there was pending before the Chair a point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that the item for the erection of the Census Building was subject to a point of order because it exceeded the authorization.

The act of May 25, 1926, section 5, alluded to by the gentleman, placed a limitation of \$50,000,000 on certain types of buildings that might be erected in the District of Columbia, including the acquisition of land. That act was amended by the act of January 13, 1928, Forty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 52, increasing the authorization by \$25,000,000. That amount was all for land. It was further amended by the act of March 31, 1930, Forty-sixth Statutes, page 136, by increasing prior authorizations an additional \$115,000,000, making a total authorization of \$190,000,000, \$40,000,000 being for land and \$150,000,000 for buildings.

Chargeable to these authorizations, buildings have been authorized in the amount of \$142,773,092.08, and appropriations of \$28,680,000 have been made under the authorizations for land acquisitions. This leaves a balance to the credit of the authorization for buildings of \$7,226,908, and under the land authorization of \$40,000,000, a difference to the credit of the authorization of \$11,320,000.

Mr. Chairman, I have personally verified these figures from the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. Therefore there is authorization for the item set out in the deficiency bill of \$3,300,000 for the Census Building.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be heard?

Mr. TABER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The act of January 13, 1928, was limited entirely to the acquisition of land. The total authorization which is available in both brackets—that is, for buildings and sites—is \$165,000,000. When you consider that authorization, of course, you have to omit from the additions those purchases which were made prior to the original act. The total authorizations for the purpose of constructing these buildings is \$165,000,000.

Turning to the figures that I have obtained from the Procurement Division, the expenditures for those purposes and the appropriations, with the limits of cost fixed, run a total of \$175,341,358.22. With that picture I still submit that the authorizations heretofore made have already been exceeded and that this appropriation is not authorized by the statutes that have been referred to, or by any other, so far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from New York concluded his statement?

Mr. TABER. I have, insofar as that primary statement is concerned. It seems to me it is up to the person proposing to sustain a proposed law against which a point of order has been made to submit the details indicating what their position is, so that we may go into that question just as far as we can verify the whole situation.

I have before me and am prepared to cite the different acts making appropriations, as far as I am relying on them. I have before me the Budget estimates out of which certain allotments were made. I think the whole matter can be very easily straightened out if it were presented in that way. It would appear clearly that the authorization for the construction of this building has already been exceeded.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to reply to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Merely to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have just cited to the Chair and to Committee the fact that we have not only examined the statutes, but I have a statement over the signature of the Director of the Procurement Division which shows the facts just as I indicated them, that there has been a total authorization of \$150,000,000 for buildings alone and a total authorization of \$40,000,000 for land purchases. I have investigated the acts, the clerk of the committee has investigated them, and I have a statement as to the accuracy of the facts over the signature of the Director of the Procurement Division. I think that disproves his case.

So, Mr. Chairman, the burden is upon the gentleman from New York to show that his facts in support of his point of order are accurate and not upon me to disprove them.

Under the ordinary rules of procedure the burden of proof to sustain a point of order is upon the party by whom it is made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, unless the gentleman from New York desires to reply to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it has always been the rule in considering points of order that the burden is entirely upon the party who seeks to bring his legislation within the authorization—to make his case.

I have before me, which I call to the attention of the Chair, a list of buildings and costs, and I have my adding-machine lists showing what the various items total, if the Chair would like to have it. I can go down the line and cover each item if the Chair requires that I cover it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not requiring anything. The Chair is merely affording an opportunity to have all the facts presented.

Mr. TABER. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit the burden is upon the party seeking to sustain the authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not require it, but the gentleman may proceed, if he so desires.

Mr. TABER. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the following buildings that have been constructed, the date of that authorization, and the amount of their cost:

Name of building	Appropriation act and in some cases part of the appropriation	Cost
Agriculture:		
Economics Building	July 3, 1926	\$325,000.00
Administration Building	do	2,000,000.00
Power plant	July 3, 1930	85,000.00
South Building	July 3, 1926	13,879,131.00
Archives	do	8,578,000.00
Central heating plant	Mar. 4, 1931	4,516,893.00
Commerce	July 3, 1926	17,500,000.00
Government Printing Office (first annex)	do	1,245,492.00
Internal Revenue (original building)	do	10,000,000.00
Interstate Commerce Commission	July 3, 1930	4,500,000.00
Justice	do	15,877,860.00
Labor	do	4,750,000.00
Interstate Commerce Commission—Labor wing (auditorium, etc.)	do	5,288,973.31
Liberty Loan	July 3, 1926	308,510.21
Post Office Department	July 3, 1930	11,730,543.00
Public Health	do	908,250.00

Name of building	Appropriation act and in some cases part of the appropriation	Cost
Supreme Court	Feb. 28, 1927	\$1,768,735.00
Triangle landscape	July 3, 1930	50,000.00
General appropriations for water lines and incidentals	Dec. 22, 1927	525,000.00
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	Aug. 12, 1935	6,325,000.00
Government Printing Office	do	7,700,000.00
General Accounting Office	do	4,700,000.00
War	June 25, 1938	10,815,000.00
Social Security and Railroad Retirement Board	do	14,250,000.00
Total		147,627,387.52

¹Land only.

The following were erected by P. W. A. allotments:

Name of building	Date of allotment	Amount
Internal Revenue extension	Jan. 11, 1934	\$2,102,000.00
Procurement Division extension	Dec. 14, 1933	1,675,281.00
Apex	Nov. 9, 1935	5,679,193.00
Archives (stacks and some interior extension)	Sept. 27, 1934	3,610,000.00
Interior	Nov. 17, 1934	13,588,421.00
Miscellaneous items (War Department site, reservation D; Zoo Park, Treasury Building, work, etc.)		2,460,075.72
Total		29,114,970.72

Every one of these expenditures was chargeable to the \$165,000,000 authorization. The expenditures for the purchase of land were for land acquired before the authorization for the purchase of land was increased, or before the \$25,000,000 was set up for that purpose. The total of all these items I have enumerated is \$176,000,000, or \$11,000,000 more than the authorization for building construction.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has read a number of items that come under the head of Public Works Administration construction. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read a paragraph from the letter I have from the Director of the Procurement Division.

In the first place, may I say, these items are not properly chargeable to this authorization. The Director of Procurement writes:

The foregoing does not take into account expenditures aggregating \$27,272,933.72, itemized on the third page of exhibit 2, for buildings and other improvements constructed in the District of Columbia under allotments by the Public Works Administration. These allotments were pursuant to Title 2 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 201), as extended by section 12 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 119), and section 201 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 357). Under section 202 of the National Industrial Recovery Act the Administrator was directed to prepare the program of Public Works, which included: "(a) Construction, repair, and improvement of * * * public buildings * * *; and under section 203 (a) the President was authorized and empowered, through the Administrator or through such other agencies as he might designate, to construct any public-works project included in that program, and the last sentence of the section made its provisions expressly applicable to public works in the District of Columbia. This legislation contained no reference to the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, *supra*, and did not otherwise limit the amount expendable under the program for projects in the District of Columbia. It has not been considered that expenditures under this program are chargeable to the total amount authorized for appropriation for projects in the District of Columbia under the Public Buildings Act, and the amendatory legislation relative thereto.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on that particular subject.

These allotments were made out of funds appropriated to the President and were allotted for the purpose of constructing certain authorized projects. I cannot see why this operation does not operate as a satisfaction of the authorization. If it is going to be held that every time an appropriation bill is brought in here it must specify the statutory basis for its authority, we are going to be in very serious

trouble because not 1 out of 20 items gives any such citation. There is not any question but that statutory authority existed and the appropriation was made. The authority was delegated to the President to allot it and he allotted money for the construction of these authorized projects. The authorization was satisfied as a result of those allotments.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Was not a part of the original expenditure for the erection of the Department of Commerce Building for the purpose of housing the Bureau of the Census, and was not the building enlarged on that account; therefore, has not that part of the appropriation which might have been applied to the Bureau of the Census already been used in preparing suitable quarters for the Bureau in the present Department of Commerce Building?

Mr. TABER. I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

When this point of order was raised on Friday last, the Chair was in some doubt as to whether the appropriation in the pending paragraph was authorized under existing law. The citation to the act of May 25, 1926, contained in the paragraph, seemed to place a limitation upon the amount of money that could be appropriated for the construction of buildings within the District of Columbia. Since last Friday the Chair has had an opportunity of looking into the laws authorizing construction within the District of Columbia. The Chair has found that the act of May 25, 1926, has been amended on two specific occasions—first by the act of January 13, 1928 (45 Stat. 52), and, second, by the act of March 31, 1930 (46 Stat. 136). These amendatory acts have increased the authorization for the District of Columbia to \$150,000,000 for the construction of buildings and \$40,000,000 for the acquisition of lands for such buildings.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] has submitted for the inspection of the Chair a letter addressed to him over the signature of the Director of Procurement of the Treasury Department. The Chair finds in that communication—and of course the Chair must rely upon the statement of an officer of the Government over his signature—that of the \$150,000,000 authorized by construction in the District of Columbia \$142,773,092.08 has already been authorized, thus leaving of the original authorization a sum of \$7,226,908 for future appropriations. Of the \$40,000,000 authorized for the acquisition of land there remains unallotted and unappropriated the sum of \$11,320,000. It is manifest, therefore, that under the acts heretofore referred to by the Chair there is sufficient authorization within the limit of cost set in those acts for an appropriation of \$3,500,000 for the construction of a Census Building. The Chair desires also to point out that the Director of Procurement in his letter to Mr. Woodrum specifically states that the erection of the new Census Building is within the area defined in the authorization acts.

The question has also been raised as to whether the construction of public buildings in the District of Columbia under allotments by the Public Works Administration should be chargeable against a limitation of \$150,000,000 set by the Public Buildings Act of 1926, as amended. The Chair has examined carefully title 2 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, section 12 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and section 201 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937. These acts contained no reference to the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended, and did not otherwise limit the amount expendable for projects in the District of Columbia as authorized by the Public Buildings Act. It seems to the Chair, therefore, that the moneys used under the Public Works Administration for the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia should not be chargeable to the total amount authorized for projects in the District of Columbia under the Public Buildings Act, as amended. The Chair is fortified in this opinion by the fact that the Director of Procurement of

the Treasury Department has placed a like construction upon this proposition.

For these reasons the Chair is of the opinion that the appropriation herein provided is within the authorization set by Congress and, therefore, conforms with the rules of the House. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of page 3 of the bill, line 3, to an item making appropriation for the New England hurricane damage and that it may be in order to make a point of order against this unauthorized expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 6, line 6, strike out from line 6 to line 16, inclusive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the point of this amendment is to strike out the entire section of the bill which provides \$3,500,000 for the acquisition of land and the erection of the new building for the Census Bureau in the Department of Commerce.

On Thursday last I acquainted the House with the amount of space being rented by the Federal Government both in and outside the District of Columbia and also gave some totals as to the number of buildings that have been erected, to indicate the extent to which governmental functions have increased. I recognize the fact that there are some functions of the Government that cannot be moved out of the Nation's Capital. Certainly, no one would pretend that you could take the Department of State, the Department of Labor, or the Department of the Interior and move them to other sections of the country, because their functions must be coordinated with other functions that are being carried on here. Conversely, however, there are some functions that can be moved from the District of Columbia. It occurs to me that the taking of the census and the tabulating of the results is one of such functions.

This can very well be done at this time without prejudicing the work of the Census Bureau or any acquisitions that have been made under the proposal in this bill. If you will examine page 21 of the hearings you will find that Admiral Peoples testified that thus far no land has been acquired for this purpose. Secondly, if you will examine the hearings on page 24 you will find that 200,000 square feet of space is now available with which to carry on the preliminary work. Since those who are conducting this work have testified before the committee that it is a progressive build-up of personnel, I think it is a fair inference from the hearings that space is now available for the work that must be done for awhile, at least. Consequently we can give some attention to the proposal to move this whole function to some other section of the country by deferring action on a new building at this time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. COLMER. As I understand, the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, as stated, is to cut out this entire section of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. I notice on reading the amendment that it cuts out lines 6 to 11. I thought I might just call the attention of the gentleman to that fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the amendment covers from line 6 to line 16.

Mr. COLMER. I believe if the gentleman will observe his amendment he will find it covers to line 11.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that if that mistake appears in the amendment the amendment may be changed to read "line 16" instead of "line 11."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that the amendment covers lines 6 to 16.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought it was line 16, and I think it was properly phrased in the first instance.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman taking the position that the country has already been overtaxed to construct monumental buildings here in the District of Columbia, and that this is an opportune time to indicate dissatisfaction with a continuation of that policy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In part I take that position. I take this position predicated on two premises. In the first place, I do not believe there is an immediate necessity for erecting this building. Secondly, if it must be built—and those in possession of expert opinion and authority and who have the figures insist that it must be built—let us build it somewhere else and decentralize this function and have it carried on away from the District of Columbia.

Further in the testimony you will find that while they state it is not economically feasible to place these functions anywhere but in Washington, D. C., yet you cannot read the record of the hearings without coming to the conclusion, from the statements of those who testified from the Department of Commerce itself, that this function may very well be moved to some other section of the country. When the time comes to erect such a building, let us place it somewhere else than Washington, D. C., and start progressively on curing the congestion and the traffic hazards that have grown up as a result of implementing the Federal personnel here until today it amounts to approximately 120,000 persons.

The center of population is today located somewhere near the Illinois-Indiana line, some seven or eight hundred miles from here. We could very well send this function out there, because it is principally a case of providing 2 weeks' work for enumerators and then going into a building with a battery of tabulating machines and tabulating the result.

On the basis of what appears in the hearings we might very well strike out this provision at this time, because it is not immediately necessary. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should stop appropriating large sums of money for the purpose of erecting great buildings in the District of Columbia; buildings which are permanent in character and which we will have immediate agitation to fill. The requirements of this Bureau, according to the story of its own representatives, are taken care of until the 1st of next January. This means they now have space in the Department of Commerce Building to take care of 2,500 of their employees, as appears on page 17 of the hearings, and they need additional space only for a period of approximately 20 months, as appears directly on the same page of the hearings. Why should we construct a building calculated to house 7,500 employees to satisfy a demand for 20 months' use in 10 years? When that great Department of Commerce Building was erected it was understood it would house the census activities and would take care of that situation. With what temporary space we can obtain both here in Washington and elsewhere there is plenty of space available to take care of this situation. We have no business going ahead at this time with terrific expenditures in Washington.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman envision a day in the not distant future when a great many of these useless buildings or commissions will be demobilized?

Mr. TABER. It is the only salvation for America. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the hearings before the committee showed that the Government is now renting in the District of Columbia 120 different buildings to house the present activities of the Government, and whatever may be said about useless bureaus and the multiplying of Government agencies and what not, I recall that one of my first committee assignments when I came to Congress 16 years ago was to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and at that time the Government was paying an annual rental bill of more than \$25,000,000 in the District of Columbia and outside of the District of Columbia. The Government has never, under any administration, pursued the policy that an ordinarily conservative and prudent businessman would pursue of trying to house his own activities with a view to economizing in space and coordinating such activities. This the Government has never done. There may be more bureaus now—I do not deny this—probably we all entertain the hope that many of them may be liquidated sometime or other, but if our fondest hopes were realized in that direction, we badly need space of this type in the District of Columbia.

This is not to be a monumental building, I may say to my good friend from Georgia. This is to be a warehouse—utilitarian type of building, costing \$9 a square foot and built for use and service.

It is perfectly ridiculous to talk about conducting this census or tabulating it at any other place than in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not just now, as I only have 5 minutes.

With the advent of social security and railroad retirement, there will be greater need for record space than ever before, and while the census field work is done out in the country at large, the tabulation and the records from which compiled must be done in the District of Columbia at the Nation's Capital.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; just briefly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no emergency about the construction of this building, is there?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We think there is an emergency.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman really feel that it would be better to spend this \$3,500,000 by adding it to the amount that the House passed the other evening here, namely, \$725,000,000, which I voted to increase to \$875,000,000, to take care of the poor and the unemployed people of this country, rather than to use this sum for the construction of a building for which there is no immediate necessity?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In the first place, there is immediate necessity for it; and in the second place, the gentleman from Virginia thinks we made ample provision for the poor and the needy people, if you can get the money to such people; but aside from that, if you do not construct this building at a cost of \$3,500,000, we shall have to have someone else construct the building and pay them not less than \$400,000 a year for it. We are paying 95 cents a square foot for space in rented buildings in the District of Columbia right now.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not just now, if the gentleman will permit me.

The evidence shows that this building will liquidate itself on the basis of rent in 10 years, and it is badly needed for governmental activities.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman realize that these public buildings we put up all cost more to operate and take care of than the rent we have been paying?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; in addition to the cost of 95 cents a square foot, we pay for the heating and the janitor service. The added expense runs the cost to around \$1.50 a square foot for renting space in the District of Columbia. Any ordinarily prudent businessman would construct his own office space rather than do this.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. And the building would also be counted as an asset and its availability to extinguish the public debt could be claimed, could it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It would be an asset, undoubtedly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 99, noes 107.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 124, noes 117.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2868, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1939, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with two amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Dirksen amendment striking out the provision for the construction of a building for the Bureau of the Census.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon the other amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the other amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 6, line 6, strike out lines 6 to 16, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced himself in doubt.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 106, noes 136.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 192, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—170

Alexander	Andresen, A. H.	Blackney
Allen, Ill.	Andrews	Boehne
Andersen, H. Carl	Angell	Bolles
Anderson, Calif.	Arends	Bolton
	Arnold	
	Ashbrook	
	Ball	
	Beam	

Bradley, Mich.	Gilchrist	Landis	Rockefeller
Brewster	Gillie	Lanham	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Gore	LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.
Bryson	Graham	Lenke	Routzohn
Buckler, Minn.	Grant, Ind.	Lewis, Ohio	Rutherford
Burdick	Griswold	Luce	Schafer, Wis.
Carlson	Gross	Ludlow	Schiffler
Case, S. Dak.	Guyer, Kans.	McDowell	Schulte
Chaperfield	Gwynne	McKeough	Shafer, Mich.
Church	Hall	McLaughlin	Short
Clason	Halleck	McLean	Simpson
Clevenger	Hancock	McLeod	Smith, Ohio
Cluett	Harness	McMillan, John L.	Springer
Cole, N. Y.	Harter, N. Y.	Maas	Stearns, N. H.
Colmer	Hawks	Mapes	Stefan
Corbett	Heinke	Marshall	Sumner, Ill.
Cox	Hinshaw	Martin, Mass.	Summers, Tex.
Crawford	Hoffman	Mason	Taber
Crowther	Hope	Massingale	Talle
Culkin	Horton	Michener	Taylor, Tenn.
Curtis	Hull	Miller	Thill
Dirksen	Jacobsen	Monkiewicz	Thomas, N. J.
Dondero	Jarrett	Mott	Thorkelson
Dowell	Jeffries	Mundt	Tibbott
Dworshak	Jenkins, Ohio	Murray	Treadway
Eaton, Calif.	Jenks, N. H.	O'Connor	Turner
Eaton, N. J.	Jensen	Osmers	Van Zandt
Elliott	Johns	Parsons	Vorvys, Ohio
Engel	Johnson, Ill.	Peterson, Ga.	West
Englebright	Johnson, Ind.	Pittenger	Wheat
Fenton	Jones, Ohio	Plumley	White, Ohio
Fish	Kean	Poage	Wigglesworth
Ford, Leland M.	Keefe	Polk	Williams, Del.
Fulmer	Kelly	Powers	Winter
Gamble	Kinzer	Reece, Tenn.	Wolcott
Gearhart	Kleberg	Reed, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gehrmann	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Youngdahl
Gerlach	Kunkel	Rees, Kans.	
Gifford	Lambertson	Robison, Ky.	

NAYS—192

Allen, La.	Dies	Jones, Tex.	Richards
Allen, Pa.	Dingell	Kee	Robertson
Anderson, Mo.	Disney	Keller	Robinson, Utah
Barden	Doughton	Kerr	Rogers, Okla.
Barnes	Doxey	Kilday	Romjue
Bates, Ky.	Drewry	Kitchens	Ryan
Beckworth	Duncan	Kocalkowski	Sacks
Bell	Dunn	Kramer	Satterfield
Bland	Durham	Larabee	Schaefer, Ill.
Bloom	Eberharter	Lesinski	Schuetz
Boland	Edmiston	Lewis, Colo.	Schwert
Boren	Ellis	McAndrews	Scruggam
Boykin	Faddis	McCormack	Secret
Brooks	Fay	McGehee	Shanley
Brown, Ga.	Ferguson	McMillan, Thos. S.	Shannon
Buck	Fernandez	Magnuson	Sheppard
Bulwinkle	Fitzpatrick	Mahon	Sirovich
Burch	Flaherty	Maloney	Smith, Conn.
Burgin	Flannagan	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
Byrne, N. Y.	Folger	Marcantonio	Smith, Wash.
Byrns, Tenn.	Ford, Miss.	Martin, Colo.	Smith, W. Va.
Byron	Ford, Thomas F.	Martin, Ill.	Snyder
Caldwell	Fries	Mills, Ark.	South
Cannon, Fla.	Garrett	Mills, La.	Sparkman
Cannon, Mo.	Gathings	Mitchell	Spence
Cartwright	Geyer, Calif.	Monroney	Starnes, Ala.
Casey, Mass.	Gibbs	Moser	Steagall
Chandler	Goldsborough	Mouton	Sutphin
Chapman	Gossett	Murdock, Ariz.	Sweeney
Claypool	Grant, Ala.	Murdock, Utah	Tarver
Cochran	Green	Nelson	Taylor, Colo.
Coffee, Nebr.	Gregory	Norrell	Tenerowicz
Coffee, Wash.	Griffith	Norton	Terry
Cole, Md.	Hare	O'Day	Thomas, Tex.
Collins	Harrington	O'Neal	Thomason
Connelly	Harter, Ohio	Owen	Tolan
Cooper	Havener	Pace	Vincent, Ky.
Costello	Healey	Patman	Vinson, Ga.
Crosser	Hennings	Patrick	Voorhis, Calif.
Crowe	Hill	Patton	Wallgren
Cullen	Hobbs	Pearson	Walter
Cummings	Hook	Peterson, Fla.	Warren
D'Alessandro	Houston	Pierce, Oreg.	Weaver
Daly	Hunter	Rabaut	Whelchel
Darden	Jarman	Ramspeck	Whittington
Delaney	Johnson, Luther A.	Randolph	Williams, Mo.
DeRouen	Johnson, Lyndon	Rankin	Woodrum, Va.
Dickstein	Johnson, W. Va.	Rayburn	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—70

Austin	Darrow	Holmes	McReynolds
Barry	Dempsey	Izac	Maclejewski
Barton	Ditter	Johnson, Okla.	Martin, Iowa
Bates, Mass.	Douglas	Kennedy, Martin	May
Bender	Elston	Kennedy, Michael	Merritt
Bradley, Pa.	Evans	Kennedy, Md.	Myers
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannery	Keogh	Nichols
Carter	Gartner	Kirwan	O'Brien
Celler	Gavagan	Lea	O'Leary
Clark	Hart	Leavy	Oliver
Cooley	Hartley	Lord	O'Toole
Creal	Hendricks	McArdle	Pfeifer
Curley	Hess	McGranery	Pierce, N. Y.

Rich	Seger	Tinkham	Wolfenden, Pa.
Risk	Smith, Ill.	Vreeland	Wolverton, N. J.
Sabath	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth	Wood
Sandager	Somers, N. Y.	Welch	
Secombe	Sullivan	White, Idaho	

So the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ditter (for) with Mr. Gavagan (against).
 Mr. Wadsworth (for) with Mr. Sullivan (against).
 Mr. Rich (for) with Mr. Dempsey (against).
 Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. McArdle (against).
 Mr. Douglas (for) with Mr. Cooley (against).
 Mr. Elston (for) with Mr. Sabath (against).
 Mr. Risk (for) with Mr. Cullen (against).
 Mr. Pierce of New York (for) with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania (against).
 Mr. Smith of Maine (for) with Mr. O'Toole (against).
 Mr. Seger (for) with Mr. McGranery (against).
 Mr. Secombe (for) with Mr. Keogh (against).
 Mr. Lord (for) with Mr. Kennedy of Maryland (against).
 Mr. Sandager (for) with Mr. Hart (against).
 Mr. Carter (for) with Mr. McReynolds (against).
 Mr. Gartner (for) with Mr. Barry (against).
 Mr. Oliver (for) with Mr. Flannery (against).
 Mr. Hess (for) with Mr. Celler (against).
 Mr. Bates of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. Kirwan (against).
 Mr. Austin (for) with Mr. O'Leary (against).
 Mr. Holmes (for) with Mr. Merritt (against).
 Mr. O'Brien (for) with Mr. Evans (against).
 Mr. Hartley (for) with Mr. Somers of New York (against).
 Mr. Vreeland (for) with Mr. Pfeifer (against).
 Mr. Barton (for) with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy (against).
 Mr. Darrow (for) with Mr. Martin J. Kennedy (against).
 Mr. Martin of Iowa (for) with Mr. Buckley of New York (against).
 Mr. Bender (for) with Mr. Curley (against).

General pairs:

Mr. May with Mr. Tinkham.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Welch.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Leavy.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Maciejewski.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Smith of Illinois.
 Mr. Hendricks with Mr. White of Idaho.
 Mr. Creal with Mr. Izac.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSOLIDATING AND CODIFYING INTERNAL-REVENUE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2762) to consolidate and codify the internal-revenue laws of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think it is such an important matter that it is proper for the chairman of the committee or some Member on the majority side to offer the House a suitable explanation of the reason for the passage of this act at this time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration, H. R. 2762, consolidates and codifies the internal-revenue laws of the United States, and would enact into absolute law instead of prima facie evidence of law all of the internal-revenue laws that are now in force.

This bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. Its preparation is the work of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, with which work the House is familiar, in cooperation with the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice. The staff has been working on this since about 1930, in cooperation with the officials of the Treasury Department and of the Department of Justice.

There is no objection to it. In fact, its passage is commended by the Department of Justice. I have a letter, con-

tained in the report, from the Department of Justice recommending the enactment of this code into law. It does not change existing law in any particular. It brings into consolidated form, into one compact volume, about 150 separate acts of Congress, beginning with the Revised Statutes, enacted in 1874. There are so many laws contained in so many volumes of the Statutes at Large that it is very confusing and it is difficult even for lawyers to determine what the law actually is, and the ordinary taxpayer cannot do it at all.

This bill makes no change whatever in existing law, but consolidates and codifies the existing law, and brings it all into one volume so that it is immediately and conveniently available.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the chairman to say this was prepared in cooperation with the Department. Printed in the volume as it first came to the Ways and Means Committee was transmitted a letter from the Department of Justice, but there was no reference to the Treasury Department as cooperating and approving this codification, as far as any written evidence is concerned. I understood at the time that the chairman of the committee had had verbal cooperation and approval of the Treasury Department, but I think it would be well for the chairman to make a statement in connection with that matter.

Another thing I would like to bring out is that when the Congress adopts this resolution and it becomes law, then there is no reference to past laws, but it is the law to date in connection with internal-revenue operations of the Government, is it not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It would have the force of statutory law. It would not be prima facie evidence thereof but the law itself.

As far as the Treasury Department is concerned—

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I understand it, this joint committee of the House and Senate has been operating on taxation for years, and this committee has had this in mind for several years. That is true, is it not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And they have been working on it not for the purpose of changing any law whatever—

Mr. DOUGHTON. No.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But to correlate the laws and bring them together in a compact form so that those who use this portion of the law—and there are millions of people in the country who do use it—may have these laws properly indexed and condensed into one volume.

I should like to ask the gentleman this question: It has been the purpose of this committee to honestly correlate these laws without any intention of making any change in the law whatsoever?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think the information which the gentleman has from these experts, and that has been corroborated by the Department of Justice, is that there has been no change in the law whatever. All it does is bring them together. It differs from some codifications. Some codifications made by the Congress and other legislative bodies implies a complete study of all laws, in an effort to take out the deadwood and inconsistencies, and resolve the inconsistencies into some form, and thereby enact a new law. In this case I understand this commission has religiously stayed away from any attempt to make any change whatsoever, but have stuck absolutely to the law. Take laws upon which the statute of limitations has run, or laws that in their own language indicate that they are now of no standing. Some of the Members on this side, particularly the new Members, are especially interested in knowing whether or not should they vote for this they will be voting for any change of law. I think the gentleman has stated emphatically that there is no change of any kind in the law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I can assure the House of that fact. Moreover, in order to safeguard and assure the correctness of this draft, and to safeguard against any mistakes, the Treasury Department has checked and rechecked through about 25 or 30 attorneys in that Department the work of the staff in order that this may be as accurate as it is humanly possible to make it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand this is the embodiment of all existing tax laws.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In what manner has the committee eliminated the deadwood? Does not this bill provide for the repeal of some of this deadwood? The gentleman from Ohio stated that experts in the Department of the Treasury have gotten together and eliminated a lot of deadwood and laws that the statute of limitations has run against. To my knowledge the statute of limitations never runs against an act of Congress, and I wonder whether by this act the committee have recommended to Congress that certain acts be repealed? And I want to suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina that I am a little concerned about what check has been made by the congressional committee to see that this is an embodiment of all existing tax laws.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the gentleman will permit, the members of the committee, of course, could not make the check with the thoroughness that the staff could make it; but the committee has agreed that it is willing to be governed by and responsible for the work of the staff of the joint committee. A similar code was completed during the last session of Congress. In order, however, that there might be no risk or doubt, we agreed to let it go over and let the Treasury Department check against the work of the staff. We have done everything possible to safeguard the integrity of the tax laws.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I have been the ranking minority member of the committee which presumably has jurisdiction over the revision of the laws and the codification of the laws. This committee presumably has a staff to do just this thing. We have found that it is of much greater help to the courts and to attorneys practicing before those courts to authorize a House or a Senate document with changes in existing laws in the codifications set up in block-letter type and in italics. This is the first time I have ever had my attention called to the reenactment of all existing tax laws.

I do not think we should be in too much of a hurry about this. This is one of the most important subjects with which businessmen, bankers, and professional men, have to deal. I think we should proceed very cautiously. Although I am usually willing to take the word of the gentleman from North Carolina, because I know that he is very conscientious about this—and the same applies to other members of the Ways and Means Committee—I do not think this bill should be passed under unanimous consent. Apparently copies of this bill are not available, at least we did not know that the bill was going to be called up today. I think the Members should have an opportunity at least to look this over, and in the quiet and privacy of their offices to make sure that no provisions of law in which they might be peculiarly interested are omitted from the codification. I am inclined, therefore, to object to the request, not because I do not have confidence in the committee to do this but because I think that the bill is of the utmost importance to the Nation and should not be passed under a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. My use of the words "statute of limitations" was rather unfortunate. I meant by that the expiration of statutes which by their own language had a limited time of application. I meant it only by way of illustration.

As I understand it, there has been no change of any kind in any law at all. If a law was found in connection with tax

matters which law in its own language indicated that it terminated at a certain date, then that law has been repealed, it has not been brought into this codification.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think that there is a possibility that the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice in their zeal to make a workable law have perhaps eliminated from this codification certain so-called unworkable provisions which have been a constant embarrassment to the Justice Department and the Treasury Department. I want to satisfy this House, and I think the gentleman from North Carolina wants to satisfy this House, that this is not done under the classification of "dead wood."

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is not here involved any question of the zeal of the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice. The lead has been taken by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The Treasury Department and the Department of Justice have at the instance and request of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation cooperated with this committee. They have not taken the lead, they have not pushed it, they are not insisting on it now, they have not urged it upon us.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to make my position clear. I am not against the bill, because I do not know what is in it. I think the attitude of the majority of the Members of Congress is that they do not know whether they are for it or against it because they do not know what is in it. Here we are dealing with a very basic law upon which this Government operates and under which it collects from \$6,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000 of revenue. I submit such a bill should not pass by unanimous consent.

I do not think I can conscientiously let this bill go through by unanimous consent without giving it more consideration, and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will withhold this request for a minute, because one of our Members on this side did not have the opportunity to extend his own remarks and until his request is granted I must object to other Members getting similar permission.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman submit his request then?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON], as published in *Colliers*.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to understand the request. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] be extended to include an article contained in a magazine?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON], as published in *Colliers*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has received permission of the copyright owner to insert these remarks?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have not received anybody's permission.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is a copyrighted article.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will take a chance that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] will not object.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, then I object to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of the regular orders in order for that day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the special orders for today I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKE- LSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE GOLD RESERVE ACT

Mr. THORKE- LSON. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my subject I should like to make a few remarks with reference to the message I heard a while ago that came from the White House. I refer not so much to the message but to the specter behind the message. I see the shadow standing behind us guiding the destinies of our people. This appeal to people who lack the necessities of life and those who lack medical care is a bid for public sympathy. What for? To destroy our business structure which has made the country great and prosperous.

It is an appeal to force this Congress, through the power to public sympathy, to consent to the destruction of our business structure. I refer particularly to the medical profession itself. I have practiced medicine for a long time and 60 percent of my work and the work of other medical men has been done for nothing. I want the people to know that, and I want the people also to know that the medical profession is one that devotes its entire career to the alleviation of human suffering and to helping people. For such work they have not asked any Federal aid.

The Federal Government, in order to gain strength itself by such public appeals to the people, to the masses, makes the statement it is going to give the people something for nothing. It uses that as a club for power to destroy the medical profession, as it has done other businesses, such as the public utilities and many other business structures in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of this Congress to know that no one occupies a more enviable position than the President himself. He cannot lose, because he appeals to the masses in order to get their support. He asks their support to give him power, and after he gets their support, if anything goes wrong, he is not to blame; he washes his hands of the whole thing, because it was the will of the masses or a mandate from the people. If, however, he is successful, he receives all the credit, and again he wins. So it is heads I win, tails you lose. And Congress sits here and takes it all while he wins. You ought to have a goat up there to look at every day. That is symbolical of your position. Sometimes it is too much for me.

This is the twelfth legislative day, and Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of all Members in this House.

As a new man in the greatest legislative body in the world, and I may say the most prolific legislative body in the world, I, of course, need advice.

My work has been confined to making a living in business. I have been captain and owner of ocean-going ships, doctor of medicine and a surgeon, pilot of aircraft, and a business-

man. I am not familiar with legislation as such, but I am familiar with constitutional law, and the rights of the people. Mr. Speaker, I realize, as one of the people, that if this body remove the people's rights one by one by law, when the last is removed, the people become slaves to legal despotism, and a legal despotism deprives the people of their rights just as successfully as the popular despotisms of today. You get a despotism by legislating yourself out of your rights, and that is what we are doing in this body.

Mr. Speaker, in a republican form of government such as ours, the Government should confine itself within the powers delegated to it by the people, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Such powers are purely administrative, regulatory, and protective.

All rights to conduct business are reserved by the people to themselves, and the people are those engaged in industry, commerce, business, labor, agriculture, and all earning enterprises. To expect that is only just and right, for this group has paid the total Government and our Nation's expenditures from its earliest beginning to date.

In other words, the Government does not earn money. It spends the money earned by the people who support it. The people have uncomplainingly fought many wars and attempted invasions, but are in despair when they must protect themselves against invasion by the government of their own creation. It is hard enough to fight attempted destruction from without, but hope is lost when the attack is launched from within, and by the very government in which the people place their hope and trust.

Being interested in recovery, I am not different from others, although my opinions may differ in the procedure for its return.

I take the view that currency is the blood which circulates in the arteries of business, and gold is the heart. The flow of currency when interrupted may cause temporary illness to business, from which it may recover, but the removal of gold-secured currency strikes a blow at the very heart of the business structure from which it will not recover until standardized gold currency is restored.

The majority of the Seventy-third Congress that voted for the Gold Reserve Act drove a dagger in the heart of business, and the Seventy-sixth Congress should remove it so as to aid recovery in our business structure.

I shall now quote verbatim four sections of the Gold Reserve Act, in which I will attempt to show that the act is unconstitutional; that it is destructive to industry, commerce, business, labor, agriculture, and all earning groups; and that it destroys public confidence in the Government and undermines the fundamental principles in which we believe.

I quote House Resolution 1491, title 1, section 2 (b):

During time of war, or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit between or payments by banking institutions as defined by the President, and export, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, by any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof; and the President may require any person engaged in any transaction referred to in this subdivision to furnish, under oath, complete information relative thereto, including the production of any books of account, contracts, letters, or other papers in connection therewith in the custody or control of such person, either before or after such transaction is completed. Whoever willfully violates any of the provisions of this subdivision or of any license, order, rule, or regulation issued thereunder shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$10,000 or, if a natural person, may be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and any officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation may be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both. As used in this subdivision, the term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, or corporation.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKE- LSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Has not the effect of the legislation the gentleman has just cited been to effectually de-

monetize gold? Has not gold been as effectually demonetized as silver in our monetary system?

Mr. THORKELOSON. I shall come to that point shortly. That is all explained in the statement I shall make.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is a fact, is it not?

Mr. THORKELOSON. Yes; that is absolutely a fact.

This paragraph, which is part of the Gold Reserve Act, was passed by the majority of the Seventy-third Congress and bestows nearly absolute power on the President over public liberties. It opens the gate to persecution; it lifts the curtain of inquisition, and, as I view the dim past, I shudder.

The words "during time of war" are used as a smoke screen for a favorable reception of the real intent of the act, which is for the President to have power "to declare an emergency." We have had an emergency for 6 years for the money changers in the temple, and this noble gentry directly or indirectly control over thirteen and a half billions of gold and gold certificates.

Our great mass of workers have labored for the money changers too long. I am now tired of it, and I believe it is time for Congress to declare an emergency for our own people, so that they may benefit in being secured by the wealth they have earned and which rightfully belongs to them.

Six years of emergency without a war is open to suspicion, and my suspicion is that something is wrong.

In this act the President may declare an emergency when he pleases. After such declaration he may investigate, prosecute, and persecute anyone to his heart's content, and end up by fining him \$10,000 and sentencing him to 10 years in prison. For what? For having in his possession gold or silver, a property which belongs to the people by right and is so declared in the Constitution of the United States. Gold is property no different from any other property, and as such it belongs to the people, the creators of such wealth.

This absolute power is not left entirely to the President, because the Secretary of the Treasury, if you please, becomes an inquisitor also. I quote section 3 (n):

Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury such action is necessary to protect the currency system of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may require any or all individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations to pay and deliver to the Treasurer of the United States any or all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates owned by such individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations. Upon receipt of such gold coin, gold bullion, or gold certificates, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay therefor an equivalent amount of any other form of coin or currency coined or issued under the laws of the United States.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELOSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I inject there the statement that under the New Deal and the progressiveness of the dollar, formerly if you had a bottle of whisky worth \$5 you were arrested for carrying the whisky but you would not be arrested for carrying gold, whereas today you are arrested if you carry gold but you can carry the whisky. This is the new method of property confiscation.

Mr. THORKELOSON. The gentleman is correct.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay all costs of the transportation of such gold bullion, gold certificates, coin, or currency, including the cost of insurance, protection, and such other incidental costs as may be reasonably necessary.

This simply means that for gold and valuable currency they hand you phoney money, but they pay transportation and they insure it so they will not lose it. They are liberal to themselves.

Any individual, partnership, association, or corporation failing to comply with any requirement of the Secretary of the Treasury made under this subsection shall be subject to a penalty equal to twice the value of the gold or gold certificates in respect of which such failure occurred, and such penalty may be collected by the Secretary of the Treasury by suit or otherwise.

I quote again:

Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury action is necessary to protect the currency system. * * *

It is astonishing that such rot, deception, and senseless words were allowed to be written into this act, and for no other reason than to betray our people. The sole purpose is for our people to trade good money for inflated or valueless currency; a most damnable fraud to be perpetrated on an unsuspecting and trusting Nation. May God open their eyes before it is too late.

In this paragraph Congress abdicated and delegated congressional power and prerogatives to the royal family. The majority of the Seventy-third Congress crowned a king, and the Supreme Court of the United States blessed the ceremony. I want Congress to understand what has been done to the great mass of American people—our people.

No doubt other emergency legislation will come up in this Congress, and it is my desire to warn my colleagues that the first duty of Congress is to determine absolutely and conclusively that all measures presented come well within the legislative power delegated to Congress by the people in the Constitution and are not dictated by personal opinions of Members of Congress or of any employee of the Government. I want you to bear that in mind. That is something this Congress has not adhered to in the history of any session. It is no use for us to blame it on anyone and say the President is guilty or someone else is guilty. Congress is responsible to the people, because all legislative power is vested in Congress. We must know that legislation is constitutional before it is passed up to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court should pass only on the mistakes of Congress, and we must know ourselves that legislation comes well within the Constitution of the United States.

Section 4 states:

In order to provide for the safer and more effective operation of the national banking system and the Federal Reserve System, to preserve for the people the full benefits of the currency provided for by the Congress through the national banking system and the Federal Reserve System, and to relieve interstate commerce of the burdens and obstructions resulting from the receipt on an unsound or unsafe basis of deposits subject to withdrawal by check, during such emergency period as the President of the United States by proclamation may prescribe, no member bank of the Federal Reserve System shall transact any banking business except to such extent and subject to such regulations, limitations, and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President. Any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, or any director, officer, or employee thereof, violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or, if a natural person, may, in addition to such fine, be imprisoned for a term not exceeding 10 years. Each day that any such violation continues shall be deemed a separate offense.

It is my desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the words in the section, "provided for by Congress," which in a subtle manner intimate that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury accepted the administration of this power because Congress requested them to do so; and Congress is betrayed by its master, or shall I say masters?

Public Resolution No. 10—House Joint Resolution No. 192—states:

Whereas the holding of or dealing in gold affect the public interest, and are therefore subject to proper regulation and restriction; and

Whereas the existing emergency has disclosed that provisions of obligations which purport to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount of money of the United States measured thereby, obstruct the power of the Congress to regulate the value of the money of the United States, and are inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar, coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts.

The premise set forth in this first paragraph that—

* * * the holding of or dealing in gold affect the public interest, and therefore subject to proper regulation * * *

is correct, but "restriction" is the stranglehold of the despot. To say that the right to receive payment in gold, gold coin, or gold secured currency would obstruct the power of Congress to regulate the value of money is an unmitigated falsehood, because the contrary is true. Gold is the only metal that lends itself to regulation, because it can be assayed, it can be weighed, and it has a standard international value.

To say that the use of gold money or gold-secured currency is "inconsistent with the declared policy of Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar" is to my mind a most extraordinary reasoning. For Congress to maintain that it can at all times control the purchasing power of every dollar is, to say the least, an unwarrantable assumption. No person or nation can control the purchasing power of money, for it is dependent upon constant fluctuation of prices, and for Congress to presume that it can regulate and control the equal purchasing power of every dollar in all the markets of the world makes Congress an international laughingstock.

I now quote the conclusion of the resolution:

Resolved, etc., That (a) every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public or private debts. Any such provision contained in any law authorizing obligations to be issued by or under authority of the United States is hereby repealed, but the repeal of any such provision shall not invalidate any other provision or authority contained in such law.

The assumption of the Senate and the House of Representatives that "obligations" which require "payment in gold" or "in money measured thereby" is against public policy, is open to the most severe criticism, and, in my opinion, places the Congress of the United States in a very embarrassing position with its own people. Congress will realize this when our workingmen and small-business people become aware of the fact that foreign governments and foreign investments are payable in gold, both as to interest and principal, while we, the people of the United States, who have worked and earned this wealth, are denied ownership or security by the property we have accumulated. I am surprised that the majority in the Seventy-third Congress was so lax in the protection of their own and their people's rights.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIROVICH). The gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] has been granted permission to address the House for 20 minutes immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Montana. Has the gentlewoman from New Jersey any objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mrs. NORTON. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The remarks of the gentleman have been extraordinarily interesting. I have placed remarks in the Record along the same line. May I ask the gentleman if he understands that, although any kind of money, of no matter what substance, that has the stamp of the Government on it shall be received as legal tender, some \$8,000,000,000 worth of gold certificates have actually been issued to the Federal Reserve? What are these gold certificates worth, in the gentleman's estimation? Why were these gold certificates given to the Federal Reserve, although the private individual is deprived of them?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Gold certificates held by interests outside the Treasury and by the governors of the Federal Reserve banks amount to approximately \$11,500,000,000. They are a lien against the gold and are used in international transactions. The money used in international transactions is based upon a dollar with a gold content of 15.521 grains, but we are not permitted to use such a dollar in the United States. Our dollar is not secured by gold or silver.

The money held by the governors of the Federal Reserve banks and other interests is held by the money ring or by the money changers in the temple, that the President said he drove out.

Mr. GIFFORD. If and when that gold is released by the Treasury, is the Federal Reserve going to get it all?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The gold reserve in the Treasury should balance the money in circulation, as was done in 1921.

In 1921 we had an inflation of nearly 36 percent, and a dollar at that time was worth 64 cents in purchasing power; and Governor Strong, of the Federal Reserve Bank, when he took charge, withdrew \$100,000,000 per month until he had withdrawn \$1,800,000,000 from circulation and the gold in circulation at that time was about \$4,393,000,000 and the money in circulation balanced the gold in the Treasury and so established a balance between the gold in the Treasury and the money in circulation. After he did that, the dollar was worth 100 cents in gold and 100 cents in purchasing value or power. We had then, as we have always had, a stabilized and secured dollar, a sound dollar, based upon gold, and recognized by international standards as such.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Returning to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts, is it not a fact that the gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve Board are simply a coverage for the lendings of the Federal Reserve banks of currency at interest, a coverage of 40 percent?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks, of course, are held by them as a lien against the gold. They own the gold that is in the Treasury of the United States, or that gold is owned by the international money ring and the people who live over in Europe and other places because those people hold the gold certificates, or they hold United States securities. We must bear in mind that every government outside of the United States holding United States securities—it does not matter what sort of securities they are—or even if such government acquire money we are using here today, such money when it goes outside the boundaries of the United States becomes a gold dollar, if you please, and its value is 15.521 grains of gold nine-tenths fine according to our valuation. It does not matter what kind of money it may be if it is in the hands of foreign governments, but we are denied that right, and that is what I object to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I would like to finish this statement, if I may.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman in accord with the recommendations made to the public today by the American Mining Congress with reference to our gold policy to be followed in the future as against what the gentleman is protesting against now?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The American Mining Congress does not bring it out clearly. I am in accord with some of its viewpoints. In the first place, we see in the papers that the United States buys gold or that the Treasury Department buys so much gold, but we do not buy gold. Gold buys our securities and the reason gold buys our securities is because foreigners in buying our securities receive a gold-bearing interest on such securities and that interest is denied to the American people. So naturally investing in American bonds becomes a very valuable investment to people who live without the United States, but we are denied the right to share in such interest or profit from our investment. We get rubber money, watered money, and if any private corporation in the United States did the same thing that the Government has done to the American people today, the Government itself would put them in the penitentiary for the rest of their lives. They are supercriminals, if you please.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the gentleman disagrees with the American Mining Congress when it recommends a continuation of the purchase of this gold at \$35 an ounce?

Mr. THORKELOSON. Well, it does not matter, because when the gold was reduced from 25.8, or 40 percent, to 15.21 grains of gold, the money was cheapened in that proportion so that it became \$35 per ounce.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that; but we are issuing tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds to someone in payment of this gold. Does the gentleman think we should continue that even if it is reduced to 15.21?

Mr. THORKELOSON. No.

I venture to say that when the American people realize the true state of affairs, many of those who were responsible for the passage of the Gold Reserve Act and other unsound legislation, will not be returned to Congress.

The people should, and I believe they will, insist that Congress repeal this act, when they realize that wages, salaries, and all earnings will, until it is repealed, be paid in inflated currency; and that insurance and other investments are not secured by gold as they were before 1933, but are instead payable only in the same inflated currency.

"Congress has the right to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and fix the standards of weights and measures." The power to coin money is not questioned. To regulate the value means exactly that and nothing else. Gold is an international standardized metal with a fixed value, and therefore is the security upon which all money and currency is based. The grain content in each piece of money regulates the value of each coin, and the number of grains regulates the value to each other and to that of foreign coin. Gold, of course, is used because it is permanent metal. It can be melted, refined, and weighed; and each grain represents a fixed value, which regulates the value of all money. When gold is removed as the standard security for money, nothing is left but inflated, valueless currency; and that is what we are using today.

Quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, 1937, page 3524:

Our domestic dollars are neither based upon nor redeemable in gold; hence the value of such dollars has little, if any, relation to the value of the foreign dollar. * * * Today we are on neither a gold nor a silver standard. As stated, the dollar is a managed money unit. We now have a commodity dollar. The value of the dollar in terms of commodities and services changes from day to day.

This is the opinion of a great Democratic Senator, and it also sets forth the administration's policy. The administration is attempting to establish a dollar based, not upon gold for stability, but upon the ability of a committee to regulate and control prices of all commodities; and I might say here, the most impossible and unsound plan that anyone could conceive, and absolutely beyond the power of anyone to fulfill.

In order that you may have a clearer understanding of such policy, I quote CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1937, page 3525:

The administration has the definite objective of raising commodity prices to such an extent that those who have borrowed money will, on the average, be able to repay that money in the same kind of dollar which they borrowed.

Let me be frank in saying that the United States seeks the kind of dollar which a generation hence will have the same purchasing and debt-paying power as the dollar value we hope to attain in the near future.

The revaluation of the dollar in terms of American commodities is an end from which the Government and the people of the United States cannot be diverted. We wish to make this perfectly clear: We are interested in American commodity prices.

When we have restored the price level we shall seek to establish and maintain a dollar which will not change its purchasing and debt-paying power during the succeeding generation. I said that in my message to the American delegation in London last July. And I say it now once more.

This is the outline of the administration's monetary policy stated by the President himself, and it is to establish the purchasing power but not the value of currency. This was true in Germany, and no doubt some of you recollect seeing postage stamps for 50,000,000 marks.

I shall now quote from the argument by the Attorney General of the United States before the Supreme Court, when he assisted in giving the Nation's gold to the money changers

in the temple and deprived our own people of the right to own and share in the property which was rightfully theirs, and as is set forth in the Constitution of the United States:

It is my belief that the word "regulate" as used in the Constitution has never been completely and carefully analyzed in all of its implications. * * * And, moreover, the word "regulate" implies a continuing power, and is the same term that is used with reference to commerce and connotes the power of adjustment. It implies the power of making the condition accord more fully with reality and with justice. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1937, p. 3525.)

The Attorney General has certainly leaned backward in his interpretation of the word "regulate," and he evidently forgot that the word referred to money and not to the regulation of abstract value. He is also right when he says "regulate" implies a continued power," but it is not as used in relation to commerce, and it is not in accord with justice. It is a question of the value of gold and the regulation of it. The reason the word "fix" is used in relation to weights and measures is because weights and measures cannot be melted, assayed, valued, or regulated at so much per grain, but are instead the standards of just what the Constitution implies—"weights and measures."

In justice to the Attorney General as to his uncertainty of the constitutionality of this act, I quote from his own words:

I do not assume to suggest what the future may develop with regard to this aspect of the constitutional question. I do not know. These things will follow in due course.

So, according to Attorney General Cummings himself, the constitutionality of the act hangs in the air, like many other experiments of the New Deal. The greatest power of all is the control of money, and it was recognized as such by Alexander Hamilton. In credit to him, it must be said that he was willing for the American people at least to own gold and to be secured by gold and gold securities. As a Republican, no one can fail to give him credit for this democratic principle. The New Deal managers have, however, outdone Alexander Hamilton by depriving the people of their right to own and be secured by gold, and have established imperialistic control over money instead of the Hamiltonian democratic common ownership thereof. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIROVICH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CASE OF HARRY BRIDGES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present to the House the facts concerning charges that have been discussed in the press and elsewhere with regard to the action of the Secretary of Labor in the Bridges case. Because I have been frequently asked by many Members of the House and others for information as to the attitude of the Secretary of Labor, in justice to her and because I wish to satisfy myself and those Members who believe in fair play, I decided to ask the Secretary to supply me with the facts in the case so that we may be able to judge the case on its merits stripped of all emotional appeal. To that end I shall read to you my letter to the Secretary and her reply to me:

JANUARY 18, 1939.

The SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS PERKINS: As a result of the recent charges made by the Dies committee with respect to the administration of the immigration laws, and particularly with reference to the case of Harry Bridges, many Members of the House have asked me, in my capacity as chairman of the Labor Committee, if there is any basis for these charges.

As you know, communism, fascism, and nazi-ism are extremely repugnant to me personally and to the political ideals for which I have stood in my public life. I am, therefore, deeply concerned

that charges should be brought that the Department of which you are the head is lax in deporting aliens who carry on propaganda hostile to our democratic institutions.

Since I am regretfully aware that you have had no opportunity to present your own report of the official history of the Bridges case to Congress, I should appreciate a statement from you as to the facts in this case and the application of the law to them.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON.

The reply of the Secretary I received this morning and reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 21, 1939.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman, Committee on Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: I am grateful to you for your letter of January 18 drawing my attention to the comments of Congressman Dies' committee on the Bridges case, as I have always welcomed any opportunity given me to give an account of my administration of the immigration laws or any other statutes, the administration of which has been given by Congress to the Secretary of Labor. I assure you that communism or any other system of political thought which has as its object the destruction of our historic liberties and the form of government of a constitutional democracy is as objectionable to me as it is to you.

I, of course, cannot agree to any charges that I have been guilty of neglect of duty in enforcing any statute of the United States. It must be remembered, however, that the Secretary of Labor has been given no roving commission by Congress to deport all aliens whose activities happen to be unpopular with many people. The function of the Department in enforcing the immigration statutes is a quasi-judicial process of administrative law based on specific requirements placed in the law by Congress. It is of importance, therefore, that in carrying out this process the Department should proceed with absolute adherence to the Constitution and with punctilious regard to the rights of individuals and for those safeguards of procedure established by the courts under the due-process clause and embodied in the regulations.

According to the records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Bridges was legally admitted to this country in 1920. It was not until the longshoremen's strike in 1934 that any complaint was made as to his status in the United States. During the strike the Department received letters calling attention to the fact that Bridges was an alien and asking that he be deported.

The various immigration acts do not forbid an alien to organize workers, lead strikes, induce fellow stevedores not to unload ships, or engage in other trade-union activities. Nor can such actions be regarded as attempts to overthrow the Government. Consequently, none of these letters contained anything relevant to the immigration laws except an occasional one which alleged that Bridges was a Communist. These charges were carefully investigated at that time, and in 1935 the San Francisco office of the Service reported that there was no evidence to show that Bridges was connected with the Communist Party or with any other radical organization, and that an investigation by the criminal-prevention detail of the San Francisco police force had reach the same result.

It was not until the fall of 1937, when the Seattle office submitted some affidavits signed by persons who alleged that they had seen Bridges participating in Communist Party activities, that any concrete charges were filed in this Department. An investigation was then undertaken which resulted in more affidavits being filed and a warrant was issued and the case set down for hearing in San Francisco in accordance with the regulations of the Immigration Service, which provides the alien with an opportunity to be heard and to be represented by counsel before any deportation order is issued, in accordance with the standards of due process prescribed by the courts.

A few days before the hearing date the circuit court of appeals for the fifth circuit, in reversing a deportation order against one Joseph Strecker, an acknowledged member of the Communist Party, held that membership in the Communist Party was not a ground for deportation. Since this was the only charge contained in the Bridges warrant which had support in the affidavits, I was told by the Solicitor of this Department that unless this decision was reversed by the Supreme Court that the charges brought against Bridges, even if proved, had no legal significance whatsoever. The officials of the Department of Justice concurred in this view, and on advice of the Solicitor and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization I postponed pending hearings in all alleged alien Communist cases until the conflict of decisions in the circuit courts resulting from the Strecker opinion was cleared up by the Supreme Court.

This action was in accord with the usual Government legal practice of avoiding unnecessary expense and multiple litigation in the lower courts when a test case is pending in the higher courts. The warrants in cases in this category have not been canceled and further action has been deferred only until the decision of the United States Supreme Court is handed down.

There is no specific reference in the immigration laws to Communists or the Communist Party. The Immigration Act of 1918, as amended by the act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1008, U. S. Code, title 8, sec. 137), upon which the warrant in the Bridges case was predicated provides for the deportation of aliens "who are members of,

or affiliated with any organization . . . that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States." In cases where Communist Party members have been deported, it has been the administrative practice of the Immigration Service to show the Communist Party was an organization thus described by introducing Communist literature indicating the political doctrines of the party. This was the procedure in the Strecker proceedings, which began in 1933, long before any complaints about Bridges had ever been received. The Solicitor has advised me that the documentary evidence offered on this point in the Strecker case was substantially as strong as the documentary evidence upon which the Government had relied in other cases for the past 15 years.

The Dies committee report has contended that the record in this case was defective in the matter of proof with respect to the nature of the Communist Party. It is not necessary to debate this point, however, since the Supreme Court has apparently taken another view. Under the jurisdictional rules of the Supreme Court, the Government in its petition for certiorari had to show that the Strecker decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit had created a genuine conflict of decisions among the circuit courts of appeal. The respondent, in opposing this petition, argued that the case was distinguishable from decisions in other circuits because of a significant difference in the evidence presented. Consequently, the Supreme Court's action in granting the writ of certiorari indicated that the Court was of the opinion that the decision in the fifth circuit represented a different construction of the law and that the Strecker case was not distinguishable from other Communist Party cases. This case will be argued next month when the Government will ask that the decision of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals be reversed. It is hoped the decision of the highest court will clarify the law so that the Labor Department can feel sure of its legal ground in dealing with cases under the 1918 act.

That the 1918 act as amended is susceptible of varying interpretations is borne out by a report submitted to the House of Representatives a few years ago by the Committee on Immigration when Congressman Dies was acting chairman. In this report it was stated that under the present immigration laws "alien Communists are not excludable or deportable as such." (See Report No. 153, House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to accompany H. R. 12044, 72d Cong. 1st sess., dated May 17, 1932.) Inasmuch as Congress took no action upon the bill reported by the committee at that time, the law today is the same as it was in 1932.

The report of the Dies investigating committee has censured the Department for postponing the Bridges hearing until the Strecker case was decided on the ground that the latter case does not have any important bearing on the Bridges proceedings. As a matter of fact, the only difference between the two is that Strecker has admitted his membership in the Communist Party, whereas Bridges under oath has denied that he was ever a member of that party.

Yet this report makes the contention that there were other grounds for deportation in the Bridges case, namely, "that he himself advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence and that he had likewise advocated sabotage." The report does not cite any evidence to support this; and, as a matter of fact, there is no such evidence.

It is possible that the committee had in mind the same extracts from two or three affidavits which Congressman Dies drew to my attention in an open letter given to the press on August 30, 1938. These consisted of certain uncorroborated remarks attributed to Bridges in private conversation by two or three of these affiants. These quotations consisted of a derogatory statement with respect to battleships, contemptuous remarks with regard to the President, threatening and intemperate remarks with respect to members of rival union factions. All of them fell far short of amounting to advocacy of the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

After this presentation of its version of the Bridges case, the Dies committee went on to say that it believed there were scores of Fascist, Nazi, and Communist aliens "who could be and should be deported if the Labor Department would proceed against them in accordance with the laws of the land." It makes the broad charge that "the laxity with which the Department of Labor deals with alien agitators would be unbelievable if we did not have before us the most convincing proof. . . . It is further believed that the failure of the Labor Department to carry out the laws with respect to deportation is a contributing factor to the widespread activities and propaganda carried on by un-American elements in the United States."

Only one other case is cited in support of this thesis. This involved an alien named Joseph Kolwaski, who was once deported to Russia because of his communistic activities and later returned to the United States. The charge is made "that he is deportable under the statute, but that the Labor Department has failed to deport him." It is a well-known fact that deportation can never be effectuated in any case unless the country of the alien's nationality issues him a passport. Thus far, both the Soviet and the Polish Governments have refused passports to this alien.

Not a single instance is cited of the committee having discovered that any Nazi or Fascist alien is remaining in this country in violation of the immigration laws, although the committee makes the claim that it had before it "the most convincing proof." In other words, the Department of Labor is condemned for serious failure

to carry out the immigration laws with respect to aliens carrying on un-American propaganda on the strength of two cases, in one of which the Department had pressed to the fullest extent of its legal authority, and the other of which action had been merely postponed pending decision on a legal question upon which even the highest Federal courts and committees of Congress have differed.

I am as desirous as any Member of Congress to preserve our American institutions and to defend them from damage by aliens. I have not found anything in the Dies report, however, which convinces me that I should have ignored the most recent holding of the courts, overruled the legal advisers provided me by law, and not postponed a deportation hearing in the face of my knowledge that even if the evidence at the hearing should sustain the charges, deportation itself could not be effected until the conflict of decisions among the circuit courts had been ultimately resolved by the highest tribunal.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

The Secretary of Labor issued a warrant for the arrest of Strecker and a hearing was then held before an examining inspector. On the basis of the findings the Secretary ordered him deported. He appealed this to the courts. The Government won its case in the Federal district court and Strecker then appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court. This court then reversed the decision and upheld Strecker. The Government then appealed this decision to the Supreme Court. This case is expected to come up next month. The circuit court reversed the decision on the grounds that Strecker's admitted membership in the Communist Party was not grounds for deportation.

Strecker admitted being a Communist while Bridges denies membership in the Communist Party. Surely no one would or could believe that the Secretary of Labor has any sympathy with the Communist Party if they know the true facts in the Strecker case—that the basis for her attempted deportation of him was that he was a member of the Communist Party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIROVICH). The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the House that I have said about all that I care to say, and also that I took the floor today merely through a sense of trying to get the true facts of a case about which there seems to be so much misinformation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentlewoman happen to know when Mr. Bridges came to this country?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not, except as the Secretary of Labor tells me in this letter. According to the records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service Mr. Bridges was regularly admitted to this country in 1920.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Has he been here ever since?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Has he made any attempt to become an American citizen?

Mrs. NORTON. That I do not know, but that question is not involved in the deportation charges. There is nothing in either the immigration or naturalization laws to compel a resident alien to become a citizen.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have heard so many rumors about Mr. Bridges being a Communist and all that, and also reflection upon the fact that he had not become an American citizen, that I was wondering about the fact.

Mrs. NORTON. According to the letter from the Secretary it was not until the longshoremen's strike in 1934 that any complaint was made about his status in the United States. During that strike the Department received letters calling attention to the fact that Bridges is an alien, and asking that he be deported. Apparently for those 14 years there has been no question about whether or not he was an alien.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Outside of his activities in connection with strikes, and in connection with communism, what has been the man's habits in the United States as to being a good American citizen?

Mrs. NORTON. That I know nothing at all about. My only information is with regard to his status under the immigration laws.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mrs. O'DAY. My information from the Department of Labor is that he entered legally and that his papers were regular and in order.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the lady from New York, and my understanding is that that is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not a fact that under the leadership of Bridges, by force, vessels entitled to sail from the west-coast ports and to enter those ports have been prevented from departing or entering?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think that charge has ever been proved, has it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentlewoman does not know anything about the west-coast strike?

Mrs. NORTON. Excepting what I have read, just as the gentleman has read it in the press and in articles. I have the same kind of information about it as the gentleman has.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it the gentlewoman's opinion that vessels have not been prevented from departing and entering?

Mrs. NORTON. I have no direct knowledge on that subject whatsoever. Of course, I have read that the striking longshoremen did not load or unload any cargoes, but that has nothing to do with the immigration laws, which is the point at issue here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No information?

Mrs. NORTON. Because I have no special information regarding the facts of record, I prefer to express no opinion. I never pass judgment without knowing the facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentlewoman means seeing it herself?

Mrs. NORTON. Seeing or having evidence that is corroborative, to prove it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the dispatches in the press do not mean anything to the gentlewoman?

Mrs. NORTON. They mean something, but, after all, you read one newspaper which gives one account of a case, and then you read another newspaper containing an entirely different version of the same subject—the gentleman will admit it is rather difficult to arrive at the real facts. I may say that is the reason I wrote to the Secretary of Labor about getting the facts that have been recorded in this case, because I think we have had a great deal of misinformation. As the gentleman knows, and as every Member of this House knows, there is not a Member on the floor who is more opposed to communism, and everything that communism means, than I am. I would do anything within my power to stamp it out. From my contacts with the Secretary of Labor, as chairman of the Labor Committee, I am forced to the conclusion that she is personally as much opposed to communism as I am. I hold no brief for Mr. Bridges, and my opinion of him is not concerned in my desire to learn the truth with regard to the application of the immigration laws to his case. If the evidence in his case proves that he is deportable I would do everything possible to have him expelled from this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask this question: If under his leadership it is true that vessels—

Mrs. NORTON. But is it true? What have you to prove that it is true?

Mr. HOFFMAN. But may I ask the question?

Mrs. NORTON. You are asking the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But I did not finish it. If under his leadership it is true that by force vessels have been prevented from sailing after the authorities had cleared them

and vessels had been prevented from unloading at the docks, would the lady consider that a defiance of United States authorities?

Mrs. NORTON. Absolutely; I would.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. You are not going to believe that anybody is a Communist simply because somebody else says he is a Communist?

Mrs. NORTON. Absolutely not.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the lady realize that during the war when two people had an argument the worst thing one could call the other was to call him "pro-German"? Now when something comes up, instead of calling a man "pro-German," he is called "a Communist." Is not that about correct?

Mrs. NORTON. It seems to be, I am sorry to say.

I recall exactly what the gentleman speaks of during the war. I do think that we throw labels around far too carelessly. It is a serious matter to say that a man is a Communist or any of the other "isms"—and I rank them all in about the same class—and not have some reason for saying it or some proof of the charge. That is the only reason I have asked for time today, in an effort to clarify this whole question in my own mind and, if possible, to give you the information I think you are all very anxious to have.

Thank you so much. I think my time has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the lady from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield if I have the time.

Mr. CARLSON. If I understood the reading of this letter correctly, there was a statement to the effect that at the present time we have no legislation which forbids aliens organizing and inciting riots and leading organized strikes in this country.

Mrs. NORTON. I think that is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. It seems to me if that is true, the lady heads the very important Committee on Labor and she should bring before this House legislation dealing with that subject, because certainly the time must have arrived to take care of that situation.

Mrs. NORTON. I would be glad to get the benefit of the gentleman's knowledge on the subject. Thank you so much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. If my time has not expired, I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I understood by the letter which the lady read that we could not deport an alien unless the country to which we were going to send him was willing to accept him?

Mrs. NORTON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What are we supposed to do with him—sink him, or shoot him, or what?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not know. I have simply quoted you the law. You understand this is not my own opinion. I have quoted you the law on this matter and the reasons which the Secretary gave. I am presenting her side of the case to my colleagues because she cannot appear before the House. And if I know anything about the majority of my colleagues, it is that they want to be fair. I do not think she should be blamed for the failure of a foreign government, over which she has no control, to issue passports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a speech that I made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman will withhold that request, due to the situation, because otherwise I will have to object.

Mr. PATMAN. It is simply a unanimous-consent request to include my own remarks.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Unless the gentleman will withhold that, I will have to object to it, due to the situation which I think the gentleman is aware of.

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to do that. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not understand the situation. If I am not to be allowed to extend my own remarks, I do not see why anyone else should be allowed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has already withdrawn his request. Does the gentleman wish to renew it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not renew it, under the circumstances. I just wanted to understand the situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, do I have permission or not?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will object to it, and that will settle it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to revise and extend my own remarks on a question I asked one of the Members.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Until we get this matter straightened out we had better hew strictly to the line.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What is the question you want straightened out?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Under special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized for 35 minutes.

MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE PERSONS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on the Tolan resolution, introduced January 19, providing for the Speaker of the House to appoint a special investigating committee of five members to inquire into the interstate migration of destitute citizens to study, survey, and investigate the social and economic needs and the movement of indigent persons across State lines, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto, which would not be of public interest but which would aid the House in enacting remedial legislation.

This was concurred in by my other good friend and colleague, Congressman GEARHART, also from California.

I have come here from the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County—this is the same as county commissioners in some of the Eastern States—where 5 supervisors handle all the 54 departments of government, including, of course, the budget; and due to that experience I believe I have some information that should be helpful and informative to this committee when formed, chiefly to indicate what is happening to some of these western communities with particular reference to their finances, and to try to show the seriousness of the matter and the necessity for speedy action.

This is a matter that certainly is a nonpartisan one and one in which both sides of this House, Republicans and Democrats, should be interested, and one upon which both these great parties can meet upon the common ground of the safety and welfare of this country above everything else.

It is the matter of the great expenditure of money and its relationship to taxes and the ability of the taxpayer to pay the bill. Our taxpayers are interested not only in the amount of Federal tax that they are called on to pay but the State, county, city, and district taxes that go to make up the total tax, for, after all, they have to pay all the tax whatever it may be.

Any of us who have served in government know that there is only one common, general source from which to obtain any amount of money that is spent, no matter for what purpose it is spent, and that is from our people by taxation.

We who have had the responsibility of general government recently further know that there is a limit to the ability of taxpayers to keep on paying and that in many places there have been serious threats of taxpayers' strikes, and that in Cook County, Ill., a taxpayers' strike did actually take place, with many detrimental results.

We further know that there is such a thing as the equalization of taxes for communities, and this should extend to the States. Therefore, I think it is fair and proper to say that the matter of indigent migration is one in which equalization of the relief load taxes can and should be equalized. This migration of indigents has thrown a disproportionate tax load on many States which they can no longer continue to bear and pay.

As an instance of what is actually happening in California I would like those of you, who do not know, to know that the treasurer and tax collector of Los Angeles County has just advised me that right now there are 275,000 pieces of property in Los Angeles County upon which the taxpayers cannot pay their taxes, and these properties have now become delinquent.

We have a moratorium provision, I may say for those of you who do not know, permitting the payment of taxes on delinquent property in 10 equal annual installments.

Many thousands of these properties have been delinquent over 5 years and have been sold to the State under our California law. How many other counties have similar conditions to face now or will have them later on? What is causing this situation?

I do not think there is any question but that this indigent migration has been one of the greatest factors in the increased tax load of many communities. This has been very well covered in the Monthly Labor Review by the United States Department of Labor, August 1938, volume 47, page 2, beginning on page 240 under Refugee Labor Migration to California, 1937.

I am not going to try to cover that here now but give this as a reference for informative information for the committee and others who should be interested.

I think part of the answer, at least, is contained in the wire from Roger Jessup, chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, which is here quoted:

All Los Angeles County watches with anxious interest the efforts now being made to halt flow of indigents here. Federal policies responsible for this influx must be changed to avoid eventual disaster. The influx of these indigents since earliest years of depression has brought on critical economic situation and tax strike is threatened as result of excessive charity burden it has imposed. Two years ago this county's charity budget was \$25,000,000, last year it was \$35,000,000, and this year it is up to \$42,000,000. More than 56,000 persons in this county alone now receive aged aid at annual cost of \$20,000,000. More than \$5,000,000 of county tax funds exclusive of cost of administration and hospitalization being spent this year to care for unemployables. Over \$950,000 this year goes to care for indigent aliens, most of whom have become permanent charges. Total county, State, and Federal aid in this county this year totals \$70,000,000. No more indigents can be handled without lowering subsistence budgets. Influx from other regions largely responsible for this situation. We look to you to save this beautiful county from becoming Nation's poor farm.

I may add that in 1928 the relief bill was \$10,000,000, but that bill has grown to \$43,000,000 in 10 years—from \$10,000,000 to \$43,000,000 for charity relief alone.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include and to have printed as part of my remarks a chart showing the county of Los Angeles financial program for 1937-38, a chart which was sent out with every tax bill in Los Angeles County.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I shall not—I wonder if the gentleman can explain how this chart will appear in the RECORD, whether it will be a photographic copy or by a graph?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I do not know how it is usual to handle such illustrations, whether by photostatic copy inserted in the RECORD or not, but I think it should be reproduced in some way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

EXHIBIT 1

County of Los Angeles financial program for 1937-38

WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM

Aid from State and United States, 26 percent.....	\$14,645,430
Taxes, 59 percent.....	34,074,831
Miscellaneous revenue, 7 percent.....	4,405,958
Surplus, 8 percent.....	4,589,106
Total.....	57,715,325

HOW THE MONEY IS SPENT

Charities, 60 percent:	
Relief, 40 percent.....	23,393,912
Institutions, 15 percent.....	8,446,816
Administration, 5 percent.....	3,148,316
	34,989,044
Services to public, 24 percent.....	13,445,134
Support of government, 10 percent.....	5,745,632
Legal payments, 2 percent.....	978,103
Reserves, 4 percent.....	2,557,412
Total.....	57,715,325

GENERAL COUNTY INCOME

The county of Los Angeles estimates that it will receive the following money to finance general county expenditures during the fiscal year 1937-38:

General taxes levied on real and secured personal property at \$1.41 per \$100 assessed valuation.....	\$32,480,916
Taxes on unsecured personal property, securities, and solvent credits.....	1,593,915
Subventions from the State and Federal Governments for aid of children and blind and aged persons.....	13,536,430
Other aid to be received from the State and Federal Governments.....	1,109,000
Fees, licenses, interest on deposits, and other miscellaneous receipts.....	4,405,958
Surplus carried over from previous year, collections of delinquent taxes, and accounts receivable.....	4,589,106
Total estimated revenue.....	57,715,325

General county-tax rates and assessed valuations, 1928-37

Year	Rate	Valuation
1928.....	\$0.72	\$3,168,361,435
1929.....	.88	3,296,558,010
1930.....	.88	3,181,324,420
1931.....	.88	3,122,441,965
1932.....	.88	2,513,695,765
1933.....	1.20	2,153,864,850
1934.....	1.20	2,083,573,720
1935.....	1.19	2,346,332,065
1936.....	1.27	2,358,947,245
1937.....	1.41	2,437,882,080

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I am not going to quote you many statistics, but am going to quote some figures taken from this graphic statement issued with every tax bill in Los Angeles County, giving an accounting as to how much and where we received the money to run government and what happened to that money, or, in other words, how it was spent. This statement was sent out so that taxpayers could see what was going on in order that they might become "charity relief cost conscious" and to get their reaction. We got their reaction. Most people do not realize the relative cost of the relief program to government nor its restrictive and limiting effect upon the necessary functions of government.

The total shown here, which is the total budget of that county, is \$57,715,000. Sixty percent of this total went to charity relief—in round figures, \$35,000,000. This was startling information not only to many officials but to our people as a whole to find that the item of charity relief had become larger, bigger, greater than the combined total of the other 53 departments of government. This graph showed that out of a tax levy of \$34,000,000, against it for payment was \$35,000,000 for the one item of charity relief alone.

The only way that government was carried on was due to the fact that there was a four and one-half million dollar surplus, \$4,000,000 that we collected in miscellaneous revenue, and that the State government and the United States Government had given \$14,600,000 to the county. In other words, it shows that if it were not for this aid received from the Federal Government the county government could not have been carried on at all under the prevailing conditions. The county tax rate has jumped from 72 cents to \$1.52. This does not include the city rates, which, when included, show for Los Angeles city \$5.44, and in many of the outlying cities a rate much higher. In other words, from 5 to 6½ percent. Out of last year's county rate of \$1.41, 73 cents went for charity relief alone and 68 cents for all the other 53 departments of government. It appears, then, that government has become incidental to charity relief, whereas, in my opinion, charity relief should be incidental to government.

We have just gone through some very trying times caused by excessive mortgages on homes and real estate, with the Federal Government trying to correct these conditions. With this tax rate of from five to seven dollars per hundred, most people do not stop to think that it has the effect of placing an involuntary mortgage on all property in the county to about 50 percent of its real value, and in which case the owner of the property upon which this mortgage is placed does not actually receive any money. This occurs when the assessor makes his valuation of the property, which in many cases is about 50 percent of its real value. Take, for instance, a man with a \$10,000 home; if a suggestion was made that a \$5,000 mortgage or trust deed be placed on his home at the rate of 5 to 7 percent per annum for which he would not receive the money, he would immediately become very much discouraged and very much frightened as to his future ability to pay it. That is exactly what we are doing when we place a tax rate of that amount on the property. While the principal may not become due, there is that tax burden equivalent to the payment of interest at the rate of from 5 to 7 percent.

I draw your attention again to the fact that the item of charity relief there is costing more than the other 53 combined departments of government. The effect of this relationship upon the other departments has been to restrict, curtail, and cut out certain necessary functions of government, as demonstrated in our forestry department, our flood-control department, and our road department.

We did not have the personnel, fire-fighting equipment, properly maintained fire trails, nor firebreaks, as was demonstrated in our fire some 8 weeks ago which burned over 23,000 acres and destroyed some 500 homes.

The flood-control department has reached its legal limit under the law as to rate of taxation. Last year \$1,250,000, and this year \$550,000, had to be taken out of the road department budget in order to continue flood-control work necessary to protect life and property.

We were unable to place any new construction for roads in our road department budget and, in addition to this, could not rebuild 19 bridges, costing from \$250,000 to \$600,000 each, that were lost in last March floods, nor take care of the approaches to these bridges.

The reason we could not take care of this was we did not have the money and could not make additional levies on the already over tax-burdened real estate and personal property of that county, as the people could not pay it, which fact is demonstrated by the further fact that there are now 275,000 pieces of property that cannot pay their taxes in this county and have therefore become delinquent. This is the record over the last 4 or 5 years, and it is getting worse.

The question might be asked why the budget was not reduced. The answer is that it was reduced and the budget of every one of the 53 departments was cut down to the danger point and some cut even below that due to necessity. This is further proven by the fact that county government was carried on for only 68 cents, exclusive of charity relief. Wherever it was possible to cut, cuts were made, but 70

percent of this budget has now become mandatory, with only 30 percent discretionary.

It should be seen from the above where the costs are. It may be informative to know, that in 1928-29, 82 percent of this charity relief budget was discretionary, with only 18 percent mandatory. The positions have been exactly reversed, with 82 percent now mandatory and 18 percent discretionary. I might state that when I use the word "mandatory" I mean that those are the things upon which there is no choice, but they are set out by law and have the effect of being commands. We must do these things whether we want to or not.

It might be interesting to know that last year the liberalization of aged aid alone cost that county between twelve and fourteen million dollars and that there are now more than 56,000 persons in this one county alone receiving that aid.

Further, in the fiscal year 1930-31 the aged aid case load was 16,226. This case load rose in 7 years to 430,500 for the fiscal year 1937-38, or an increase of 2,550 percent in 7 years. This was brought about by the enactment of Federal legislation. In order for California to receive benefits thereunder it had to change its legislation to conform with that of the Federal Government. These changes were as follows:

Cutting the required age from 70 years to 65 years.

Changing the residence requirement from 15 years to 5 years.

This let down the bars to many thousands. In order to take care of the new load with proper registration, we had to put on 107 additional personnel, and this personnel was making appointments in August to meet these people as late as March of the following year, all to draw aged aid relief of \$35 per month.

It is interesting to know that a memorandum was prepared by Los Angeles County for Mr. Harry L. Hopkins as of his request of July 7, 1937, and things have become worse since then.

The relative cost per capita was 92 cents in 1925, and in 1936 this had risen to \$44.62. When this same figure is reduced to relief cost per taxpayer, leaving out those who are on relief, it is found that they have risen to \$87.51. When the additional figure for supplying medical and institutional relief to resident and nonresident indigents is included, this adds an additional \$8.98, bringing the total cost per capita to \$94.28 for the year 1936, and conditions are now worse. That same statement shows (par. 5, p. 2) that the California State Department of Agriculture reported 2,460,614 persons entered the State of California by automobile in the 12-month period ending April 30, 1937, with the destination of 74 percent of these persons given as southern California. A substantial proportion of these people volunteered that they were in need of manual employment and that over 75 percent were from so-called drought States. During this same period—April 1937—there were 101,510 on charity relief made up of aged, 43,000, which figure you will note has now jumped to over 56,000; blind; orphan children; indigent; general hospital; tubercular sanatorium; poor farm; and convalescents.

The question may arise as to why the county should take care of these people under the limitations of the State law. We do not take care of them directly, but here is exactly what happens. They have arrived, out of employment and in most instances destitute and hungry, and in this condition—say the wage scale is \$3.50 per day—they will work for less and if enough of them continue to come they will work for still less. They then fill the positions in many capacities of those people who are residents, thus throwing the residents who are qualified for relief directly on to the relief rolls, which in turn throws an immediate burden upon the taxpayer, breaks the wage scale, and lowers the American standard of living.

Business and industry are restricted by reason of being unable to sell to these people of a lower standard of living, and by reason of less volume, pay rolls are lowered in number, which in turn causes more unemployment. It

creates a very vicious circle in which every person in California is interested—the taxpayer, the businessman, the laborer, and last but not least, all those who are entitled to receive benefits must watch the resources used to pay for these benefits melt away.

I give you this information hoping it will disclose the picture of conditions not only in Los Angeles County but similar conditions prevailing in Kern, San Joaquin, and many other counties, and I hope this may be publicized because many of these things are not known to people who have not actually handled budgets, and I believe it is the duty of every governmental official to give his people the facts.

California is a State which, on account of natural conditions, should and can sustain itself and its people, but most of the cause of all this financial difficulty is the great indigent migration of people from other States. This State can carry its own load but it cannot carry the load of the other 47 States in addition to its own. I, therefore, believe there is plenty of room for the equalization of this tax load.

People have come to this State on account of its climatic conditions and the fertility of the State itself, and in addition to that to receive aged-aid benefits and charity benefits, but the Federal Government is not bearing its rightful proportion of these costs. It is self evident that the number of people on relief in that State is out of proportion to the population.

It is true, that the Federal Government does make grants to the various States for the purpose of relief and for the further purpose of helping these States financially to care for their people. This should have the effect of reducing the State tax load in these States, and, in my opinion, it does, but here is a fact that must be considered: That in those States which are receiving this Federal aid to take care of their relief load, when great numbers of those receiving relief migrate to other States, it has the effect of further reducing their taxes, but when the States to which these people migrate do not get the funds which were supposed to go to these indigents, such States automatically have their tax load increased, and this is what is happening to California and to many other States.

It is the opinion of people of the State of California that this relief money should follow that migration.

We are prepared in California, through our records, to tell where every migrant comes from, and we believe that the Federal Government should recognize the inequality of having the State of California take care of other States' loads without additional funds with which to do it.

It is my belief that if the tax load becomes so heavy in this or any other State that it becomes uneconomical to carry on any business, to own homes or own property; that there is nothing but failure ahead; and in order to protect against a situation of this kind is one of the reasons I am making this talk.

Some States might take the view that they are accomplishing something for themselves by sending this load on to California, through this migration of people on relief, but these States must remember that when the resources of California are gone, these same people will have become accustomed to relief, and they will then go back to the States which can carry them, either to the Southern States, where climatic conditions are attractive and where it does not cost so much to live, or to those Northern States which have great capital; and these people know which these great States are, and they will go there knowing that they have the money to carry them. This should be given consideration by every State.

The statement will probably be made that California is advertising for these people. This statement is not true, because if one will take the trouble to read the advertisements that are carried by California it will be found therein that the specific request is made not to come to California looking either for a job or for relief. California does advertise, and I maintain that it must continue to do so, for industry to come, and for those people who have the means to sustain themselves. We must do this out of self-defense,

for while we have so many jobless people it would be foolhardy, in my opinion, to discontinue bringing in those industries which bring employment to our people.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona rose.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. My time is limited, and what I am about to say I think will answer some of the questions that may be in your minds.

To show that conditions are getting no better, out of this year's budget of some sixty-eight millions, forty-three millions are set aside for relief.

I want it understood right here and now that I do not want anyone to draw from my statements the inference that I am against necessary relief. I am not; and I have just as much kindness in my heart and just as much charity in my heart, and so has the State of California, in the consideration of this matter as anyone in this room; but regardless of that, that State is finding it impossible to carry the whole load. We can and will carry our own.

I want it further understood, too, that I cast no aspersions of any kind upon those people who are on relief and who have migrated, for I believe them to be, in many instances, very fine people who have found themselves in this unfortunate condition over which they have had no control. But I would like to draw to the attention of those who are already on relief, particularly in California, that if this migration continues it will eventually take that aid that they are now getting away from them, after all resources are used up.

To those people who are disabled and to those who find themselves in unfortunate circumstances and are willing to work, my heart goes out, but to those who have become professionals, in this matter of relief, and who are living off those who are on relief, I say it is high time that we close the doors. I mean by this last group, those pressure groups who constantly appear before legislative bodies with a selfish purpose in mind demanding higher and higher relief costs, such as the Workers' Alliance has done in Los Angeles County, and those other pressure groups who advocate higher costs without regard to the ability of the people to pay. The danger is that many legislative bodies will have a false conception of the real conditions by reason of the numbers of these people who appear before them, and that these legislative bodies will lose their idea of relationship between the number of these people compared to the number of people who are actually paying the bill, for, after all, the taxpayer, who is in the majority and is paying the bill, is too busy to come before these bodies to give his side of the picture.

Roughly speaking, I believe it is true that about 14 percent of our people are on relief, and that the 86 percent who are not are paying the bills. It is high time, too, that we give this 86 percent some consideration, for certainly we cannot go ahead and wreck the 86 percent no matter how kindly we might feel toward the remaining 14 percent. We must not forget that, after all, this 86 percent can and does sustain the Government and the 14 percent, by paying the bills, and the 14 percent cannot sustain either the Government or the 86 percent. We must also watch that this 86 percent should not be lessened and the 14 percent be increased, because somewhere along the line there certainly is a danger point in this balance, and after that danger point is reached and passed our whole governmental and business structure will eventually fall.

We must not teach our people not to work nor that they should look for relief instead of looking for work.

We must teach them to become self-sustaining.

REMEDIES

It is not sufficient to talk only about these things, but remedies must be looked for.

First. This resolution by Mr. TOLAN should be supported, the investigating committee appointed, and the investigation made.

Second. The suggestion is that the Federal Government should provide relief for marginal people in their home States in order to prevent much of this migration.

Third. The Federal Government should disseminate information at the sources of this migration that there will be no relief available to nonresidents of California or States where these same conditions apply.

Fourth. The Federal Government should encourage and aid the return to their homes of the idle thousands now in California and in other States who have neither lost their legal residence in their respective communities nor achieved legal residence in California or other States.

Fifth. The Federal Government should recognize the inequality of having California or other States pay for these people who have come into their respective States from the outside and should transfer the money that is granted for relief to the States to which these people have moved.

Sixth. It should equalize and make uniform the benefits of aid to the aged so as not to make those States which are paying aged aid benefits pay all migrants from those States which are not.

Seventh. It should be driven home to people who are contemplating migrating that it would be far easier to find work in communities where they are known and where jobs are to be found than it would be in a strange place; that in that community where they are known they would have the additional help of those who know them in finding positions.

I hope that the things mentioned herein will be given careful consideration by you gentlemen from the respective States, because eventually you are going to have to reckon with this situation; and while this situation in California and some other States may now be more acute than that in your own, remember, when the resources of these States are gone these migrants will go to the places where there are still resources left and where they can be taken care of. I ask your full consideration of this and hope you will realize the importance of this matter to the welfare of all our people. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I ask the question in all seriousness: Does the gentleman believe that these transients have gone to California more from the standpoint of climate than they have in order to secure these old-age benefits which have been pointed out, being led very, very largely by propaganda which has come out of California, not from State authorities but from those who have advocated great payments to the aged? Which has been the drawing card, the climate or the expected monetary benefits?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. The matter will have to be segregated by periods. During the present period, in the last 4 or 5 years, due to the high rates paid by the State of California these people have been flocking to it.

This can be proved by inquiries that are coming into that State asking for the amount of aid we pay. In prior years it may have been true that they went there on account of climatic conditions, but now I think it is a combination of both.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us assume you had a \$10,000 home in this county at the present time. I mean a home that would sell to a willing buyer for \$10,000. What is your assessed valuation and what is the annual taxes on that home?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. The valuation would be from \$4,000 to \$5,000 on a \$10,000 home and the taxes would be about \$200.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I may say to the gentleman we have cities back in the Northern States in which the taxes are double that rate at the present time and we have not that influx of people.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That is probably due to your climatic conditions. I have interviewed some of these people, and I want to cite one specific instance. I asked a man why he came, and he said, "We will not freeze in this country." He said further, "I do not have to buy coal, and if I have not an overcoat my people will not freeze to death." He said, "I think I have a right to come here under those circumstances." If you have a home with a valuation of

\$5,000, with a \$200 tax, you are getting taxed pretty stiffly. Regardless of the tax rate and valuation in your State or mine, that does not say that the taxes in my county are too high or those in the gentleman's county are too high.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It does not; but the taxpayer enters into the matter.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the county where the tax is now \$500 per year instead of \$200 per year the taxpayer is no more able to pay the \$500 plus than the man in California with a tax of \$200.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Is the gentleman giving me a hypothetical case?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am giving the gentleman an actual case. I could produce the tax receipts to show this. I have spoken on the floor about this matter time and time again.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I happen to know something about taxes, having been on the tax board of my county for a number of years. It all depends on your method of taxation. If your assessor puts a \$10,000 valuation on that property, that is one thing; but if he puts the same valuation on that we do—50 percent of its actual valuation—then you get a different figure. It all depends on the respective rates. In other words, we have to put them on a comparable basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate that.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. In our county the assessor puts on a 40 to 50 percent assessed valuation and the \$200 is predicated on that assessed valuation. If our assessor assessed on a 100 percent basis, then the tax would be \$455.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's program of preparedness is not the only "getting ready" that is being done by this administration.

Some may have thought that the appointment of Frank Murphy as head of the Department of Justice was merely his reward for his aid to Lewis, the C. I. O., and the Communists during the Michigan sit-down strikes, but as the President called him back from the Philippines to become Governor of Michigan, so now he is placing him in a position where he can aid in controlling patronage for the 1940 campaign.

Nor was Murphy slow in delivering the goods. Toward a successful campaign in 1940 control of the W. P. A. posts in Michigan would be a great aid.

Let me quote here what the Michigan Times, published at Grand Rapids, had to say on this subject. I quote:

JOB NO. 1 FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

If former Gov. Frank Murphy is confirmed by the Senate to the post of Attorney General of the United States, job No. 1 on his docket should be an investigation by Attorney General Murphy into the conduct of Lame Duck Murphy in connection with the affairs of the Works Progress Administration in Michigan.

He won't have to go far for the evidence; he can consult his own conscience—that conscience which in his public speeches he refers to so frequently and with such warm approval.

No public figure in our time has basked in his own self-approval to quite the same extent as has Frank Murphy. About every third sentence in his stump speeches concerns his purity of motive, his purity on his own admission being such that he must look down with some contempt on a well-known soap, which is only 99¹/₁₀₀ percent pure.

Well, let's see how this one-man purity league operates.

He was defeated at the polls last fall by an electorate that had become more than a trifle allergic to conversation unaccompanied by action. On December 31 he left office, his right wrist somewhat lame from patting himself on the back, and departed for Washington. Immediately things began to happen.

You see, if Michigan is to be carried by the Democratic new dealers in 1940, control of the W. P. A. key posts in Michigan is a vitally necessary factor, according to the ideas of Mr. Murphy. The worth of the continual assertions of the new dealers that "no political coercion of W. P. A. employees would be tolerated" is revealed by Mr. Murphy's next step, which was to "promote" the

capable and honest Louis M. Nims, State W. P. A. administrator, to a post in Chicago and appoint Col. Abner Larned, of Detroit, to succeed Nims.

The idea was that by "promoting" Nims and getting him out of the State, in a few months he could be dropped with less outcry and his place filled by a more complaisant and politically minded new dealer. Nims saw this move coming, refused the promotion to the Chicago post, and accepted a position as deputy State highway commissioner under Murray Van Wagoner.

Then the program continued. It was necessary to provide a job for Charles Weber, former treasurer of the Kent County Democratic Committee, former secretary of the State administrative board, and (most important of all) manager of Murphy's 1936 campaign in Kent County. So the next move was to discharge on a week's notice Albert D. MacRae, west Michigan regional director of the W. P. A., and give his job to Weber.

For 3½ years MacRae had headed the W. P. A. in 21 western Michigan counties, and in that time the honesty and integrity of his character and the excellence of his technical training had produced results so obvious that the western Michigan district was frequently cited by national officials as a model of what W. P. A. should be. He brought to his job, a job that involved the spending of millions of dollars of the public funds, a wealth of experience as an engineer, a building contractor, and a highway constructor. No hint of scandal was ever breathed against his handling of his office; he refused to play politics with human misery, and no W. P. A. employee ever received from him any "orders" as to how he should vote.

Literally hundreds of schools, hospitals, and public buildings, mile after mile of highways, sewer systems, and waterworks projects were erected under his direction. In 3½ years Louis M. Nims, as State administrator, and Albert D. MacRae, as regional director, made only one mistake, and that mistake was fatal.

It was a mistake that was easy for honest men to make.

That mistake was this: They accepted at face value the protestations of the new dealers that W. P. A. was not to engage in political activity. They refused to "turn on the heat" even when such a New Deal darling as Frank Murphy was fighting for reelection. As a result, they're out.

This then, translated into actual action, is all that Mr. Attorney General's fervent apostrophes to purity in government really mean. It means that an able engineer, doing an engineer's job and doing it well, must be removed to make room for a former instructor in junior high school who has, as far as the record shows, never spent a day directing any construction project anywhere. Mr. Weber will now direct the work of thousands of men and the expenditure of millions of dollars, and his qualifications for this post? He was Frank ("Purity-in-Government") Murphy's Kent County campaign manager in 1936!

As they sing in Gilbert and Sullivan's "Patience," "Why, what a particularly pure young man this pure young man must be!" You can take the witness now, Mr. Attorney General.

Some may have thought that kicking Harry Hopkins upstairs and out of W. P. A. was to place him beyond the reach of those who have exposed his use of Federal funds for political purposes. That may have been one purpose, but we should not forget that the 1940 census will soon be in the making; that the appointment of thousands of census enumerators will fall under the jurisdiction of Hopkins as Secretary of Commerce.

Having shown in the W. P. A. his exceptional ability for the distribution of Federal relief funds where they would do the most good politically and having been caught distributing money appropriated for food, clothing, and shelter for the purpose of purchasing votes in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and other States, Hopkins can be more useful in this new field.

Oh, yes, the President advocates preparedness. Just as he induced Democratic Congressmen and Senators during the first years of his administration to give him a blank check for billions of dollars, much of which his subordinates used in an effort to defeat the very men who trusted him, who voted him the money, so now he is again preparing in advance for the political campaign of 1940, with control of the National Democratic Convention as his immediate objective.

It is more than passing strange that those Democrats against whom the powers and the money of the Federal Government will be used cannot see the handwriting on the wall, or lack the courage to check him in his effort to destroy them as well as our form of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the address we have just heard of the gentleman from California has been particularly interesting to me, for I find that my State of Arizona, of which I am the sole Representative in this body, has very similar problems and is harassed by the same difficulties, if not to the same degree, as is the Golden State on the Pacific coast. It is true that we have some of the same economic inducements in Arizona, and, in addition, we have other inducements which give us a slightly different phase of the problem than that which the gentleman from California has explained to us. It is about this different phase that I wish to speak briefly.

Since 1849 and the memorable gold-rush days California has been the land of promise, not only to the people of the whole United States but to the people of other lands as well. It has been regarded as a new land of untold economic possibilities. It is not surprising that the gold rush has continued and has gradually lost itself in the sunshine rush of recent years; but when it comes to furnishing sunshine for health purposes Arizona vies with her neighbors in that regard. We are glad to tell the world of this fact, but we do not wish to overadvertise our climate in this respect, for we in Arizona much prefer that the rest of the country shall know that Arizona is as good a place for the well to come and live long as for the sick to come and get well. It is the latter class, however, in all parts of the country, who are better and more widely informed than is the former class.

In view of the fact that Arizona, in its remarkable topography, affords a range of temperature and climate such as is found from the Equator to the North Pole, with sunshine everywhere, makes it ideal as a natural sanitarium for those afflicted with sinus trouble, arthritis, asthma, or tuberculosis. It is equally favorable for those who wish to avoid contracting such physical ailments. Of late years eastern doctors are quite likely to say to certain of their patients, whether the patients be wealthy or poor, "Go to Arizona." Just as California has been for a long time "the land of promise" so has Arizona for a shorter time been known as "the land of health."

Most of the transient and indigent folk who enter California do so through Arizona; probably more than 60 percent enter over Highways 60, 66, 70, and 80; or, if they go by rail, over the Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific Railroads. Not all of those who enter Arizona on the east pass entirely through the State, for many of them stop in our southern valleys as migratory farm laborers. The easiest way to get to California from any part of the country lying to the east is through southern Arizona, which accounts for so many entering California from Arizona and explains in part why so many stop in Arizona.

In the House RECORD for Saturday, August 21, 1937, I had something to say in the last Congress about Arizona being "Uncle Sam's sun parlor," and at that time I pointed out that the United States Government, as well as various churches and fraternal organizations, recognized the merits of our curative climate by establishing hospitals, sanitariums, and such institutions in our land of sunshine. We welcome all such efforts, and we want physically distressed citizens from all parts of the country to come to the health-giving climate of our southwestern community. At the same time, it should be known we are struggling under a heavy burden which is thrown upon us. Especially is this true with regard to the indigent sick.

Hundreds of families are flocking into Arizona with one or both parents suffering from tuberculosis, and they feel that if they can only reach the desert, no matter how poor they may be, the cure will be quick and inevitable. Many pathetic cases have come to my personal attention.

The health authorities of Maricopa and Pima Counties and the State health authorities have explained to me the distressing situation. The local authorities cannot take care of these poor folk, nor even protect their children who may be afflicted unless some Government protection is offered them.

A recent school survey shows an alarming amount of tuberculosis among school children in Arizona. I am positive that

these afflicted children were born in other States and brought the tuberculosis with them to Arizona. The superintendent of the largest school system in Arizona urged me to work with him to provide open-air schools where tubercular children may be given physical care at the same time their minds are being developed. But that same school system has been growing by leaps and bounds, so that the rich community is unable to house its school children adequately, and is now very much overcrowded and lacks even ordinary housing facilities. The community cannot possibly furnish open-air schools for its tubercular children.

However, it is not for the tubercular school children alone that I make this plea, but for parents and children of the many, many transients who struggle to the "land of sunshine," live under most deplorable conditions, with the hope that the healing rays of the sun will check this dread disease. I do not know what proportional part good food, clean, and comfortable surroundings, together with pure air and sunshine, have to do in curing tuberculosis, but I do think it is too much to expect a starving family to get well on sunshine and climate alone. In Arizona there is a minimum resident requirement necessary before indigents may receive local government aid. That is a very cruel but necessary local provision. Certainly the General Government ought to do something to help take care of these transient sick.

If an investigation is to be made of this whole relief problem, Arizona will be more interested in proportion to wealth and the load which she is carrying than any other Southwestern State. I do feel that this is an urgent matter, and I do hope that Congress can view the situation as a national problem worthy of immediate attention.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing in the RECORD two speeches I made in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, on page 19 of the semi-monthly Congressional Record Index No. II I am credited with having introduced H. R. 2335, a bill for the relief of Dent Allcroft & Co. The author of this bill, I understand was Mr. CROWTHER. I ask unanimous consent that the Congressional Record Index may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MITCHELL, for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, January 24,

1939. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Commissioner Splawn, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is expected to be the first witness.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs in room 1310, New House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., January 24, 1939, for the consideration of the President's message on national defense.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will begin Wednesday morning, February 1, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation, in the Ways and Means Committee room of the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

305. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to remain available until June 30, 1940, for the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 123); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

306. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exchange certain property located at Veterans' Administration facility, Tuskegee, Ala., for certain property of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

307. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report prepared by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration on operations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

308. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 28, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on survey of Orowoc Creek, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 126); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

309. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 28, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Merrimack River, N. H. and Mass., requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted March 27, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

310. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 3, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Eli Cove, an arm of Stoney Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

311. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 28, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Greenwich Harbor, Conn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

312. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 30, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Tacoma Harbor, Wash., with a view to modifying existing project for Wapato Waterway, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 2, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 124); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

313. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of a naval supply depot, Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1101) granting a pension to Daniel W. Perkins; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 1131) granting a pension to Helen H. Sly; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 1286) granting a pension to James P. Stone; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2219) for the relief of Ame La Fernais; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2220) for the relief of Henry Werre; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2680) for the relief of James Moffitt; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2859) for the relief of Harry J. Thiessen; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2904) for the relief of Peter Koutsaymanes; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2927) granting an increase of pension to America E. Dye; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2937) granting a pension to Alfred Arrowood; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3022. A bill to amend paragraph 761 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase duty on cashew nuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDWELL:

H. R. 3023. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of St. Marks River, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3024. A bill to provide for the conservation of her-
ring in the waters of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3025. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214-1215); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 3026. A bill authorizing the Legislature of Alaska to alter, amend, or repeal certain laws of Alaska imposing taxes for carrying on business and trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3027. A bill for the erection of a public building at Iuka, Tishomingo County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 3028. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office and Federal building at Olympia, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 3029. A bill to provide for the prompt deportation of aliens engaging in espionage or sabotage, alien criminals, and other undesirable aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3030. A bill to provide for the deportation of aliens subsisting on relief under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3031. A bill to provide for the deportation of aliens inimical to the public interest; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3032. A bill to protect American labor and stimulate the employment of American citizens on American jobs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3033. A bill to further reduce immigration, to authorize the exclusion of any alien whose entry into the United States is inimical to the public interest, to prohibit the separation of families through the entry of aliens leaving dependents abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee:

H. R. 3034. A bill to set up a research section in the Bureau of Patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3035. A bill to fix the maximum rate of interest on loans secured by veterans' life-insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PIERCE of Oregon:

H. R. 3036. A bill to change the name of Pickwick Landing Dam to Rankin Dam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3037. A bill prohibiting deficiency judgments in real-estate foreclosures by the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal land bank commissioner, and the Federal land banks, and prohibiting an increased rate of interest after maturity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3038. A bill providing for Congress to coin and issue money and regulate the value thereof by establishing the Bank of the United States, owned, operated, and controlled by the Government of the United States; setting forth the scope and manner of the Bank's operations; creating a Board of Control and defining the powers and duties of the Board and other persons charged with the Bank's management; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 3039. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office building in Wilmington, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 3040. A bill to provide for the acquisition of drydock facilities for the United States Maritime Commission at Los Angeles Harbor, in the city and county of Los Angeles, and to authorize the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 3041. A bill to amend section 202 (c) of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. R. 3042. A bill to provide eligibility for compensation for service-connected disability unless due to willful misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide that any World War veteran suffering from paralysis, paresis, or blindness, or who is helpless or bedridden, or who is totally disabled may be awarded compensation, if otherwise entitled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 3044. A bill granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3045. A bill to provide for the location and construction of a through multiple national highway system; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 3046. A bill to increase the number of National Guard aviation units; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3047. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3048. A bill to relinquish concurrent jurisdiction to the State of Kansas to prosecute Indians or others for offenses committed on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GILCHRIST:

H. R. 3049. A bill to provide an exemption of family-sized farms from the \$10,000 limitation of soil-conservation payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 3050. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Attorney General to compromise suits on certain contracts of insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 3051. A bill for the relief of certain workers performing emergency work at Cairo, Ill., in the Ohio River flood of 1937; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3052. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 301 (b), paragraph (3); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 3053. A bill to legalize a bridge across the Ottawa River at Summit Street in the city of Toledo, State of Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3054. A bill to provide for promotion procedure within the executive classified civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 3055. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain employees in neuropsychiatric hospitals of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 3056. A bill to reclassify the salaries of the foreman and requisition fillers and packers in the Division of Equipment and Supplies of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 3057. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3058. A bill to provide annuities for certain widows of employees and retired employees of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3059. A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 75 of the National Bankruptcy Act of 1898, as amended (U. S. C., Annotated, title 11, sec. 203a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3060. A bill to provide an 8-hour day and a workweek of not in excess of 6 calendar days for employees in homes, hospitals, and combined facilities of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CALDWELL:

H. R. 3061. A bill to extend the time within which to file an application for a quitclaim deed to certain property in Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3062. A bill to encourage the employment of local capital in the mining of oil and gas on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 3063. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1937; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 3064. A bill authorizing Federal participation in the commemoration and observance of the four hundredth anni-

versary of the explorations of Francisco Vazquez de Coronado; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 3065. A bill to amend Public Law No. 370, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 906); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Texas:

H. R. 3066. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, approved August 15, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3067. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of a naval supply depot, Oakland, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation with respect to alleged efforts of privately owned public utilities unfairly to control public opinion concerning municipal or public ownership of electrical generating or distributing facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Stephen Foster; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. Res. 65. Resolution authorizing the Special Committee on Wildlife Conservation, appointed under authority of House Resolution 237, Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44, Seventy-fourth Congress, and House Resolution 11, Seventy-fifth Congress, to continue its investigations during the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 66. Resolution to provide funds for the committee authorized by House Resolution 65; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution adopted January 13, 1939, with reference to maintenance of county roads; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. R. 3068. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lois E. Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Katharine W. Murray trust; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 3070. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfred O'Donnell and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3072. A bill granting a pension to Charles J. Rague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 3073. A bill for the relief of John Larison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Edgar Green; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLUETT:

H. R. 3075. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Pingrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland:

H. R. 3076. A bill granting a pension to Howard E. Toison; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Adam Casper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALY:

H. R. 3078. A bill for the relief of A. D. Cummins & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3079. A bill granting compensation to Reuben R. Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWELL:

H. R. 3080. A bill granting an increase of pension to Adaline Loftus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Margaret B. Nonnenberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 3082. A bill for the relief of Frank Gedney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3083. A bill for the relief of Addie T. Caughman and Grace Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 3084. A bill for the relief of Violet Dewey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 3085. A bill for the relief of the Bruckmann Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3086. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lawrence Rusche; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3087. A bill for the relief of Gdynia America Line, Inc., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3088. A bill for the relief of Pauline B. Raphael; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Margaret Dunn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3090. A bill for the relief of C. R. Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 3091. A bill for the relief of Col. Ernest Graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona:

H. R. 3092. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. O'DAY:

H. R. 3093. A bill for the relief of Felix Kusman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3094. A bill for the relief of Luise Ehrenfeld; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3095. A bill for the relief of Mirko Markovich; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3096. A bill for the relief of Yankiel Owslanka, alias Jack Singer; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 3097. A bill for the relief of Lulu M. Peiper; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3098. A bill for the relief of James E. Breslin; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3099. A bill to place Edwin H. Brainard on the retired list of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3100. A bill for the relief of Capt. Francis H. A. McKeon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3101. A bill for the relief of David W. Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 3102. A bill granting a pension to Sarah J. Wilder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3103. A bill granting an increase of pension to Louise Essenmacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3104. A bill for the relief of Kyle Blair; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee:

H. R. 3105. A bill for the relief of C. C. Tulloch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3106. A bill for the relief of Harry Waller; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3107. A bill for the relief of Gordon W. Lovin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3108. A bill for the relief of R. E. Rule; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Helen Louise Giles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3110. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

424. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the lifting of the so-called Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

425. By Mr. BALL: Petition of certain citizens of Middletown, Conn., favoring our adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

426. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of certain citizens of St. Augustine, Ill., urging the amending of the Neutrality Act to include civil conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

427. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of Grays Harbor Council, Washington Commonwealth Federation, Aberdeen, Wash., urging that the Dies committee has accepted evidence of rumor and opinion without a basis of fact; asserting that the committee has used investigators who are known stooges and strikebreakers; stating that the committee has used its facilities to interfere with the election of progressive men to public office; and therefore opposing appropriations for the continuation of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

428. Also, resolution of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, Hollywood, Calif., charging that the Dies committee investigating un-American activities allowed perjured witnesses to fill its records with false testimony and permitted the committee hearings to be used to damage New Deal candidates in political campaigns; asserting that no opportunity was afforded those against whom charges were promiscuously hurled to appear before said committee and testify regarding same; therefore urging that Congress refuse a further grant of money for said committee's continuation; to the Committee on Rules.

429. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of certain citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., urging adherence to the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

430. Also, petition of certain citizens of Gloversville, N. Y., urging retention on the statute books of the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

431. Also, petition of certain citizens of Gloversville and Johnstown, N. Y., urging that the embargo against Loyalist Spain be lifted; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

432. By Mr. DALY: Petition of Rev. George T. Montague and 3,740 other citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, protesting against the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

433. Also, petition of Rev. E. F. Cunnie and several hundred other citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, protesting against lifting the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

434. By Mr. HARTER of New York: Resolution of the Knights of Columbus, Buffalo Council, No. 184, Buffalo, N. Y., urging that they go on record opposing any change in existing legislation which would in any way lessen the obligation of our Government to observe strict neutrality with regard to the civil conflict now raging in Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

435. Also, resolution of the Holy Name Society, St. Francis de Sales parish, Buffalo, N. Y., and the Polish Priests' Association, Diocese of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., urging that their secretary petition the Congress, for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

436. Also, petition of the Buffalo Teachers' Union, Local No. 377, American Federation of Teachers, Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against taxation which will jeopardize the pension funds of civil service or educational employees and against increased burdens on the States and municipalities through Federal taxation of State and municipal revenues and non-reciprocal taxation of State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

437. Also, petition of the members of the Holy Name Union of the diocese of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

438. By Mr. HAWKS: Petition of 86 residents of Cross Plains, Wis., protesting against any change in the neutrality policy of this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

439. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of certain citizens of Newton, Kans., and vicinity, urging that for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

440. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of Richard Finnel and 20 other citizens of Denmark and Maribel, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

441. Also, petition of J. M. Steingraeber and 152 other residents of Kewaunee, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

442. Also, petition of Rev. L. M. Schorn and 19 other residents of Wausaukee, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle set forth in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

443. Also, petition of George Zettel, Maplewood, Wis., and 107 other citizens of Maplewood, Forestville, and Sawyer, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle set forth in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

444. Also, petition of Cyril Virlee, of Brussels, Wis., and 53 other residents of Brussels, Forestville, and Sawyer, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further

and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

445. Also, petition of Francis Murphy and 49 other citizens of Manitowoc, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

446. Also, petition of T. C. Berceau and 53 other residents of Green Bay, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

447. Also, petition of B. H. Pennings and 322 other residents of West De Pere, Green Bay, and De Pere, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

448. Also, petition of Father John O'Donovan and 289 other residents of Appleton, Wis., respectfully petitioning the President and Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary act to include civil as well as international conflicts; also urging that Congress launch an investigation of those leftist groups which are sponsoring propaganda favoring the lifting of the embargo on arms to "red" Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

449. Also, petition of Harry Blick and 21 other citizens of Appleton, Wis., respectfully petitioning the President and Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary act to include civil as well as international conflicts, also urging that Congress launch an investigation of those leftist groups which are sponsoring favoring the lifting of the embargo on arms to "red" Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

450. Also, petition of Glenfred Demro and 28 other residents of Goodman, Wis., respectfully petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

451. Also, petition of Robert Baumgart and 35 other residents of Maribel and Denmark, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

452. Also, petition of Rev. W. Koutnik and 22 other citizens of Reedsville, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

453. Also, petition of Dr. F. A. Komoroske and 19 other residents of Algoma, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil

as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

454. Also, petition of August C. Engels and family, and 43 other signers on cards, petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

455. By Mr. KEAN: Petition of Wilbert V. Kinney and sundry other citizens of the Twelfth Congressional District of New Jersey, urging consideration of the subject of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

456. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of the Lions Club of Marietta, Pa., setting forth a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

457. Also, petition of 34 citizens of the State Teachers College, West Chester, Pa., setting forth a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of the members of the American Association of University Women of Bloomington, Ind., expressing their views on the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

459. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Wyandotte, Mich., requesting the Federal Works Progress Administration Administrator to rescind the lay-off order and continue mothers and women on present projects; also to reemploy on Works Progress Administration projects all persons previously employed on projects whose unemployment insurance has run out; to the Committee on Appropriations.

460. Also, resolution of the mayor and Common Council of the City of Lincoln Park, Mich., requesting the Works Progress Administration to rescind the lay-off order and continue mothers and women on present projects; also to reemploy on Works Progress Administration projects all persons previously employed whose unemployment insurance has run out; to the Committee on Appropriations.

461. Also, resolution of the Polish Activities League, Detroit, Mich., opposing the lifting of the embargo on arms to Spain, opposing aid and comfort to combatants, and recommending an investigation of such conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

462. Also, resolution of the Detroit Municipal Employees Club, Inc., Detroit, Mich., protesting against any proposal for retroactive taxation of municipal employees' salaries and taxation of State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

463. Also, resolution of the Council of the City of Highland Park, Mich., opposing taxing of municipal securities and revenues of States and municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

464. Also, resolution of the Common Council of the City of Ann Arbor, Mich., opposing Federal taxation of municipal revenues, bonds, and incomes of municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

465. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Durant H. Macomber and 30 residents of Taunton, Mass., urging passage of the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

466. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Brooklyn Heights Americanization Committee, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging continuation of the Dies investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

467. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Memorial of the Vermont League of Women Voters, through their president, Irene Cheney, of Randolph, stating their interest in providing discrimination in the application of embargoes if there is intended revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

468. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Montpelier, Vt., and the SS. Donation and Rogatian Parish, Randolph, Vt., urging

that so long as the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, is adhered to, the further corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, be retained on the statute books; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

469. Also, memorial of 30 citizens of Rutland, Vt., petitioning enactment by the Seventy-sixth Congress of the General Welfare Act (House bill 2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

470. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of William F. Korst, Joliet, Ill., and 49 interested persons, recommending the adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of May 1, 1935; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

471. By Mr. SANDAGER: Petition of the City Council of Providence, urging retention as a part of the national deficiency appropriation bill, such provisions as will continue the reimbursement for nonlabor items to municipalities carrying on the Works Progress Administration projects on the basis of \$7 per man per month; to the Committee on Appropriations.

472. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Reverend Francis J. Flanagan Council, No. 1907, Knights of Columbus, Mountsville, W. Va., and 64 members, urging the United States Senators and Representatives to vote to retain the act of May 1, 1937, extending our neutrality to civil as well as international conflicts, and to keep the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. Also, petition of the Ohio County Teachers' Association, Wheeling, W. Va., urging the passage of a bill to prevent the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

474. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the Knights of Columbus of New Haven, Conn., urging that the Government of the United States adhere strictly to its present policy of absolute neutrality with respect to the war in Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

475. Also, petitions of Marie Tocco and other citizens of Detroit, Mich., urging the Congress to adhere strictly to the general policy of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

476. By Mr. TERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Arkansas (the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas concurring therein), urging that the Congress of the United States of America, acting through the United States Department of Agriculture, establish, or cause to be established, a soil-erosion experimental station in Arkansas adequate to serve the needs of the farmers in the Harsville soil area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

477. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Resolution of American Legion Post No. 516, Hollidaysburg, Pa., approving the resolution of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

478. Also, resolution of the Twenty-first Bicounty Council of the American Legion, condemning un-American propaganda and activities; to the Committee on Rules.

479. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter J. O'Brien, Bronx, New York, petitioning with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

480. Also, petition of the South Jersey Port Commission, Camden, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commercial fishing boats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

481. Also, petition of the American Legion, Herman Schumacher Post, No. 921, Dolgeville, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

482. Also, petition of the Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc., New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted January 11, 1939, with reference to the deportation of illegally entered criminals; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

483. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

484. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

485. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

486. Also, petition of the Missouri State Society, Sons of the American Revolution, St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

487. Also, petition of Al Kojetinsky, of St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to rehabilitation project in southeast Missouri; to the Committee on Appropriations.

488. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Anthony Parish, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their petition with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

489. Also, petition of National Lawyers Guild, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution dated January 18, 1939, with reference to Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

490. Also, petition of the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America, New York, petitioning consideration of their bulletin No. 248, dated January 1939, with reference to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1939

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 17, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, January 23, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE LATE SENATOR EDWARD P. COSTIGAN

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, before the Senate begins the consideration of the relief joint resolution, I desire to make a brief statement on a matter which is rather close to me.

My friend and former colleague, ex-Senator Edward P. Costigan, of Colorado, passed away at his home in Denver on Tuesday, January 17, 1939.

Senator Costigan served in the United States Senate from March 4, 1931, until ill health forced his retirement from active duties in March 1936. The record of his life and his achievements is written large in the history of his State and the Nation, so that no recital of them is necessary; but I do wish to express a few words of personal appreciation of his character and services and my regret at his passing.

Senator Costigan was one of the most courteous, considerate, and best-liked Senators who ever sat in this body. He was a gentleman in the best and truest meaning of the term. He was gifted with an unusually fine mind, which had been cultivated and developed by a lifetime of study and thought.

He devoted the major efforts of his life to the advocacy and support of measures for the promotion of the public welfare. He always held close to his heart the interests of the less fortunate and the underprivileged. He never hesitated or faltered in his course because of fear of consequences.

The illness and death of Senator Costigan was a severe loss to his friends, his State, and his country. He will be remembered and mourned by an army of devoted friends and admirers throughout the land.

I submit as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington News very appropriately but briefly commenting upon the life and public services of Senator Costigan. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

COSTIGAN OF COLORADO

Edward P. Costigan literally wore himself out in the service of the American people. His whole career was a battle for the general welfare, fought with those finest of weapons—intelligence and courage.

There was nothing of the opportunist in him. He supported causes because he believed them to be right, even when he knew them to be unpopular.

As a lawyer he defended the coal-mine strikers of Ludlow when that meant the enmity of the most powerful influences in Colorado. He followed Theodore Roosevelt into the Progressive Party and labored against hopeless odds to keep that party alive after the defeat of 1912. He enlisted to promote Woodrow Wilson's tariff ideals and remained a minority member of the Tariff Commission through the Harding-Coolidge administrations to resist the sabotage of those ideals. He was elected to the Senate 2 years before the New Deal, but the liberal policies which he supported and in large measure inspired represented the convictions of a lifetime.

We felt it as a great tragedy when Senator Costigan's health broke under the strain of ceaseless, selfless work and he found it impossible to be a candidate for reelection in 1936. He was not one who could be content in idleness. Years of inaction when there was so much needing to be done, so many disadvantaged people needing help, could have brought him little but unhappiness. We think of his death as a merciful release to rest well earned by one of the most gallant men we have known in public life.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has asked that a newspaper clipping be printed as a part of his remarks. Does it include the poem which was read at Senator Costigan's funeral?

Mr. ADAMS. It does not.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit me to have the poem inserted in the RECORD following his remarks?

Mr. ADAMS. It will be a pleasure to me if the Senator from Nebraska will do it now. I have concluded what I had to say.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a clipping from the Rocky Mountain News, which includes a poem on life in general written by Senator Costigan himself and read at his funeral. I received the poem from the ex-Governor of Colorado, Hon. William E. Sweet.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article and poem are as follows:

[From the Rocky Mountain News of January 20, 1939]

COSTIGAN'S OWN POEM ON LIFE READ AT FUNERAL—VERSES WRITTEN JUST BEFORE DEATH COMMEND "BOLD EXISTENCE"

A poem written a few months ago by former Senator Edward P. Costigan as symbolic of his life was read at his funeral yesterday by the Very Rev. Paul Roberts, dean of St. John's Cathedral.

Political and personal friends, many of whom could not get into the crowded Costigan home at 1642 Detroit Street, where the services were held, stood in silence while the dean recited A Lightning-Shattered Pine. The poem read:

Let aspen crowds salaam the storm;
I was the pine, my monarch form,
Crag spurning, backward frowned the cloud,
Till lightnings wrapped me in their shroud.
Rich is their need who own no fears,
Upon the mountain top of years.
I lie; my monster limbs divide
And, blasted, waste, but save their pride.
My downfall is old prophecy
For which no fellow mourning be,